

**Learning to Work in Fundamentally New Ways:
Understanding Dynamics Among Social and Formal Supports for Practice**

by

Amina Halim-Rahman Allen

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
(Educational Studies)
in the University of Michigan
2018

Doctoral Committee:

Associate Professor Donald Peurach, Chair
Associate Professor Robert Jagers
Clinical Assistant Professor Maren Oberman
Associate Professor Deborah Rivas-Drake

Amina Halim-Rahman Allen

ahallen@umich.edu

ORCID iD: 0000-0003-4797-6855

© Amina Halim-Rahman Allen 2018

To Deborah Zaki (mom) and Stacy Ward (sister).
This would not have been possible without your unconditional, steadfast love and support.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I must first give all praise and gratitude to Allah (God) for It's Grace, Mercy, Protection and Guidance. This is yet another example, in my life, of the power and willingness of God to guide creation from Darkness(es) into Light.

I acknowledge my ancestors—both slaves and “feminists.” I am utterly humbled by the remembrance that, for them, this accomplishment was quite literally impossible, if not, unimaginable. I acknowledge the pain, humiliation, anger, fear, blood, sweat and tears of every single slave, freedom fighter, suffragist, feminist and prayer warrior who came before me....I AM because you WERE. It is on your collective shoulders my success builds on.

A number of individuals, institutions and organizations have had a significant and direct impact on my success over the past seven years. To them, I offer my heartfelt and specific thanks:

- My mother, Deborah Zaki, for indoctrinating me from a very young age with the belief that academic success and college-going were expectations rather than options, possibilities or choices. I believe this is the single most reason why this accomplishment was even possible.
- The University of Michigan School of Education and the Rackham Graduate School, who took the gamble on me as a student and who provided the generous financial support as a Rackham Merit Fellow.

- My advisor and dissertation chair, Donald Peurach, for his patience, guidance and support. I do not think I would have been able to do this with anyone else but you, Don. Thank you.
- The Alliances for Graduate Education and the Professoriate (AGEP). The spring dissertation writing retreats—which I was fortunate enough to attend twice—were absolutely indispensable to moving my work forward.
- Candi Reddick (aka Chyna) for always being an example of black excellence and for a friendship that has stood the test of time. I love you. Thank you.
- Jean Mrachko whose willingness to proofread and edit this manuscript was literally, I believe, a God-send.
- Dr. Wendy Carter-Veale. Your assistance, no-nonsense approach and encouragement, as a dissertation coach and AGEP dissertation writing retreat facilitator, brought me a long, long way.
- The Center for the Education of Women (CEW) for providing financial support that helped me move this work forward during a pivotal time.
- My committee members—Deborah Rivas-Drake, Maren Oberman and Robert Jagers—for their thoughtful contributions and feedback.
- Leaders at Origins Inc. for helping to make this dissertation study possible.
- Linda Woodward for your mentorship, friendship and support.
- To Savannah, Jazmin and Jaycee for being my hang out buddies. It was the time spent with you guys that helped restore my sanity and keep my feet planted.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Dedication	ii
Acknowledgments	iii
List of Tables	vii
List of Appendices	viii
Abstract	ix
 CHAPTER	
 I. INTRODUCTION	 1
Statement of the Problem	1
Motivation for the Study	2
Purpose of the Study	3
Study Design	3
Preview of the Findings	4
Preview of Discussion and Conclusion	6
 II. ANALYTIC FRAMEWORK	 7
Introduction	7
Critical Analysis	9
 III. METHODOLOGY	 34
Research Questions	34
Study Background: Leveraging Existing Research (and U-M Partnerships)	34
Case Study Design	35
Sources of Evidence	40
Analysis	44
 IV. FINDINGS: DD’s DESIGN FOR CLASSROOM MANAGMENT PRACTICE	 48
Foundational Underpinnings of the DD Design	49
“A Practical Approach”: DD’s Ten Core Practices and Structures	63
DD’s Capabilities for Classroom Management Practice	68
Discussion	77
 V. FINDINGS: DD’s FORMAL AND SOCIAL SUPPORTS OF PRACTICE	 78
Introduction	78
DD’s Formal Supports of Practice	80
DD’s Social Supports of Practice	88
Tight and Loose Integration among DD’s Formal and Social Supports of Practice	96

Discussion	104
VI. FINDINGS: TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF SUPPORTS	107
Introduction	107
Review of School Sites, Participants, and Sources of Evidence	109
Teachers' Valuing of Supports of Practice in Developing Capabilities	110
The Value of Localized, School-Based Supports of Practice	124
Shaping DD Practice: Patterns in Teacher Change	133
The Role of School Context in Enabling and Constraining DD Capabilities	138
The Role of Teacher Characteristics in Enabling and Constraining DD Capabilities	143
Discussion	149
VII. FINDINGS: THE VIEW FROM THE TOP: DD LEADERS' PERCEPTIONS OF CHALLENGES TO DEVELOPING DD CAPABILITIES	150
Introduction	150
Challenges Emanating from Schools and Their Environments	151
DD Expert Coaching and Ongoing Partnerships with Schools: Growing Rarities	156
Internal Instability, Adaptation, and Unanswered Questions	159
Discussion	164
VIII: DISCUSSION	166
Introduction	166
Formal and Social Supports	166
A More Comprehensive View on The Work of Capability Building	170
IX. CONCLUSION	174
APPENDICES	176
REFERENCES	185

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1	Sources of Evidence by Research Question	43
Table A	Descriptive Statistics—Scaled Variables (N = 54)	176

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX

A. Comparison of Scaled Variables for Teacher Survey	176
B. Teacher Survey	177

ABSTRACT

After more than a half century of school reform efforts, perhaps the single most important learning is that there is a need to place laser like focus on effectively defining, shaping and changing teacher practice. The investigation of one educational provider's attempt at developing capabilities for classroom management increases awareness of how external school partnerships can (more or less) facilitate the development of practice-based capabilities. Understanding how such designs and supports of practice operate within individual schools and across classrooms informs the field about the micro and macro implications of changing teacher practice.

This cross-case exploratory study classroom management component of a commercialized middle school social-emotional program examines its supports of practice (both formal, social and the interdependencies among them), the ways in which these supports shaped (or failed to shape) teachers' practice and the factors that enabled and constrained the development of desired practice capabilities. This study comprises data gathered through program documentation, semi-structured interviews, participant-observation and teacher surveys. Participants included teachers, school leaders, school-based coaches and program leaders.

The analysis of these data draws on what is known about the use of formal and social supports of practice in large-scale instructional change involving external partners (e.g., Reading Recovery, Success For All, high-performing charter/educational management companies). Formal supports codify existing knowledge of what to do and how, while social supports leverage practitioners' expertise and collegial interactions. Whereas formal and social supports have historically been considered in exclusion of the other, this literature supports that they are complimentary, mutually reinforcing supports.

While my findings support that formal and social supports of practice, and their interdependent use, are critical to developing capabilities for practice, I identify a number of environmental, school and teacher-level enabling and constraining factors that expand and complicate this narrative. More specifically, these factors expand and complicate

understandings regarding the affordances and limitations of formal and social supports and the mutually reinforcing roles schools and external partners have in developing capabilities in support of external designs.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

How can we make ambitious teaching possible to the extent that one can be a mere mortal and yet still achieve it?

-Magdalene Lampert, University of Michigan

Two questions shaped my practice as a school leader: One, what would it have taken to keep me in the classroom? And, two, what would it take for me to send my kids to this school?

-William Price, Eastern Michigan University; Former School Principal and Superintendent

Statement of the Problem

Education in the United States has been under reform for more than a half century. During this time, more has been added to education reform's exhaustive agenda, and school reform has given rise to various policies, programs, strategies, and instruments commensurate with its goals. Among these are: more demanding (and arguably more uniform) nationalized performance standards (e.g., Common Core); arguably weaker teacher unions coupled with the infusion of private money and influence; the introduction of alternative routes to teaching, value-added test scores and merit pay; and, the growth of the school choice movement and for-profit education sector (schools, products and services). Like the list of school reform goals, this list also continues to expand.

Despite all of this activity, reform efforts continue to fall short of desired results. Many researchers, reformers, and practitioners point to evidence-based outcomes that suggest that, in large part, these efforts have failed to lead to drastically improved educational outcomes, particularly for at-risk students.

Among many explanations, two in particular help shed light on the failure of school reform to meet its intended goals. First, school reform efforts have failed to adequately address the development of *capabilities for practice*: the requisite knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to *perform* in new ways. Developing capabilities for practice is distinct from other reform strategies such as improving school culture and climate, curricula and testing, and

internal school structures and resources (e.g., learning time and materials). For example, the Common Core State Standards (an example of a reform focusing on policy, curricula, and, by extension, assessment) do little to address teachers' abilities to meet the new teaching and learning demands they require.

Second, in addition to the paucity of reform goals and strategies focusing on developing capabilities of practice, we also know comparatively less about the ways in which such capabilities are developed, especially at a large scale. Though there is some empirical research on developing large-scale instructional practices, such as Success for All and several other large-scale interventions, less is known about other types of capabilities for practice.

Motivation for the Study

The motivation for this study is, in part, an outgrowth of my experiences as a teacher in a poor-performing, high-minority high school. In my school, capabilities for practice—as it pertained to teaching and managing behavior—were largely left up to each individual teacher to define, create and improve.

Our school's social studies department consisted solely of first-year teachers. Common curricula, teaching materials, instructional strategies, norms of collegiality and professional learning, and administrative monitoring and guidance ranged from weak to nonexistent. Only a classroom set of textbooks and state standards were offered as guides to effective teaching.

Also weak to nonexistent were common school- and classroom-level behavioral expectations, procedures, and supports. Much like other aspects of teaching practice, each teacher was left to devise his/her own classroom management practice.

The absence of academic and behavioral guidance did not thwart repeated attempts at improving in these areas. In fact, school improvement activity was ubiquitous and often cyclical in nature. These attempts often began with a proclamation to improve followed by some combination staff development, program adoption, and the pursuit of grant monies to support these endeavors. They often ended with little positive change and yet another proclamation to improve.

The fact that all of these activities appeared to be nearly ineffectual when it came to improving the actual practice capabilities of actual teachers in actual classrooms working with actual students both amazed and frustrated me. In essence, my teaching experience drove me investigate the broad question of just how do we tackle the wicked problem of changing

established teacher (and schooling) practice? How did we manage to simultaneously pursue change so often and manage to change so little? What could we, or should we, have done differently?

In sum, this research contributes to understandings of how to create capabilities for practice. It is my belief that shedding more light on this subject is the key to making ambitious teaching a less burdensome task, especially in our most needy schools. I believe that making ambitious teaching more achievable will stymie the exodus of teachers from the profession, especially in challenging school settings. I also believe that it will greatly increase the likelihood that, one day, schools serving historically underserved children will look more like the schools to which many of us send our very own children.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to understand how external providers attempt to develop capabilities for practice. Specifically, I attempt to understand how capabilities for practice are developed through the use of *formal and social supports for practice*. The term "formal supports for practice" includes "first-principles" as well as hard resources that codify existing knowledge (e.g., in materials, documents, technology) to define and guide practice.¹ Similarly, "social supports for practice" refers to resources that define and guide practice through personal interactions and professional exchanges (e.g., teams, work groups, coaching, and mentoring).

This dissertation explores the ways in which one commercialized middle school program—Developmental Designs (DD)—leverages formal and social supports to develop teachers' capabilities for classroom management practice. It also investigates DD-trained teachers' perceptions of these supports and the ways in which they shape (or fail to shape) their practice, as well as the perceptions of DD leaders regarding the challenges of developing ongoing DD capabilities.

Study Design

Research Questions

1. What is DD's design for the day-to-day classroom management practice of teachers?
What are the capabilities for practice required by this design for practice?

¹ By "first-principles" I mean a category of support involving the implicit/explicit transmission of the broad premises, postulates and goals informing design (Baden-Fuller & Winter, 2005).

2. What formal supports for practice (e.g., first-principles, scripts, routines, supplementary guidance, codified materials) and social supports for practice (e.g., training, internal coaching/consultation, PD, performance feedback, etc.) are provided to develop those specific capabilities?
3. What are teachers' perceptions regarding: (a) more/less valuable supports of practice; (b) the ways in which these supports shape/fail to shape teacher practice; and (c) factors that enable/constrain the development of capabilities for DD practice?
4. What are DD leaders' perceptions regarding the types of challenges constraining the development of ongoing capabilities for DD practice in DD-trained schools?

Methodology

I investigated the above research questions through a cross-case exploratory case study of two middle schools -- James Garfield Middle School (JGMS). These schools were located in two Midwestern states.² Both of these schools were identified as high implementing DD-trained schools. My sources of data included semi-structured interviews, participant-observation of a weeklong DD training, program documentation and teacher survey data (taken from a broader study). My study participants included 14 teachers, two administrators, two internal coaches and three DD leaders responsible for developing initial and ongoing capabilities for DD practice in schools around the country.

Preview of the Findings

Findings: DD's Design for Practice

First, my analysis supports that DD's design for classroom management practice is both philosophical *and* practical. Understanding and implementing the DD approach as designed requires an understanding of (and alignment with) both DD's underpinnings and discrete teacher practices. That is, while DD's design for practice is built upon a bedrock of philosophy, theory, and research (concerning adolescent students, education and classroom management), at the center of its design are a set of discrete teacher practices (i.e. DD's "ten core practices and structures").

Second, my analysis also supports that DD's design for classroom management differs drastically from modal management practices of typical U.S. schools and teachers, requiring the development of specific capabilities of practice. The constituent capabilities for practice needed

² In the interest of protecting identities, I used pseudonyms for both schools and names, where given.

to enact DD in classrooms lie in a combination of: (a) dispositional traits (i.e. teacher mindsets); (b) conceptual/foundational knowledge of the DD design; and (c) procedural skill/practical knowledge.

Findings: DD's Formal and Social Supports of Practice

First, DD's formal supports emphasize what I call procedural guidance. By procedural guidance, I mean categories of support that directly assist teachers' in-classroom use and enactment of the DD approach, particularly its ten core practices. Analytical categories of procedural guidance include: (a) structures, strategies and routines; (b) teacher language scripts; (c) teacher planning and enactment resources; (d) supplementary (cognitive) guidance; and (e) teacher practice exemplars.

Second, social supports of practice (i.e. workshop training and several coaching models) emphasize what I call training "modalities," which privilege developing teachers' capabilities through experiential learning. DD workshops leverage a common set of training modalities used to support teachers' basic understanding of the DD design and acquisition of the capabilities needed to enact it. By modalities, I mean the specific designs for professional learning employed by workshop designers and facilitators to help participants gain an understanding and facility with the DD approach. These training modalities emphasized social-constructivist approaches to learning within a community. The training modalities employed in DD workshops include: (a) immersion; (b) participant enactment; (c) application; (d) demonstrations and observation; (e) collective sense-making structures; and (f) didactic instruction. Importantly, while workshops are used principally to introduce teachers to the DD design, coaching is designed to develop implementation fidelity and sustainability of the DD approach. Thus, workshop training and coaching are designed to work hand in hand.

Third, while there was a high degree of interdependence between (a) workshop training and procedural guidance and (b) aspects of DD coaching and procedural guidance, less integration was found between (a) other aspects of DD coaching and procedural guidance and (b) the use of workshop training modalities and procedural guidance (in terms of DD's design for reactive/corrective discipline, specifically).

Findings: Teacher Perceptions of DD's Supports of Practice

First, teachers placed the highest value on DD's social supports for practice (specifically, workshop training) as well as locally created, school-based supports for practice. Teachers did

not consider coaching—neither DD expert coaching nor internal (peer) coaching—as an important support for developing DD-specific capabilities. Neither did they view the formal supports of practice contained within DD media (e.g., procedural guidance, supplementary guidance, etc.) as sources of support, post-DD1 (and DD2) training.

Second, there was wide variation in teachers’ perceptions about the ways in which DD shaped (or failed to shape) their classroom management practice, particularly with respect to reactive/corrective discipline (use of The Pathways of Self-Control), both within and across school sites.

Third, variation among teachers and between school sites was influenced by several teacher- and school-level factors that were reported by teachers as enabling and constraining the development of DD capabilities. Teacher-level characteristics included teacher personality, style or mindset and regression to past practice. School-level characteristics included school-leadership practice around DD and the (non)existence of competing school initiatives.

Findings: Leader Perceptions

DD leaders identified five challenges emanating from within schools and their environments that constrained their ability to develop capabilities for DD practice. These challenges included: partial implementation of DD’s full complement of formal and social supports of practice; implementation fatigue (due to the number of initiatives); school officials minimizing the drastic change in practice required by the DD approach to classroom management; shifts (and decreases) in educational funding and areas of focus; and shifts from external coaching (i.e. DD expert coaching) to internal coaching (i.e. peer coaching).

Preview of Discussion and Conclusion

I conclude this manuscript by interpreting my findings in light of my critical analysis of the literature informing this study as well as my analytic framework, including implications for research, developing capabilities for practice and school leadership practice.

CHAPTER II

ANALYTIC FRAMEWORK

Introduction

In order to improve student outcomes, 50 years of school reform point to the need to create and develop capabilities for practice rather than, for example, simply developing school culture, organizational structures, and policy (Peurach & Glazer, 2014).³ The essence of outcomes-based school improvement is that schools and school staff perform tasks they have never performed before or perform familiar tasks in unfamiliar ways. Yet developing the capabilities necessary to engage in new practice has proven most difficult in U.S. public schools and, especially, in chronically underperforming schools.

Both the need for creating new capabilities for practice and the problems surrounding it are multifaceted. One problem is that ambitious school improvement places huge demands on the initial capabilities of schools, capabilities that are likely weak in chronically underperforming schools.⁴ Another problem is that there are contrasting approaches to creating capabilities for practice. These contrasting approaches invite debate and are supported by conflicting empirical evidence. A third problem is that creating new capabilities in schools often requires comprehensive, integrated designs for both organization and practice.

Despite these challenges, one way to successfully go about creating capabilities for practice is through the use of externally supported school improvement designs. This type of school improvement involves collaborations between schools and various school improvement agencies, including government, education, commercial enterprises, nonprofits, and other

³ My definition of creating capabilities for practice is helping practitioners acquire the requisite knowledge, skills and tools to enable them to perform in new ways.

⁴ Ambitious school improvement is school improvement that has as its goal to drastically alter the structures, processes, culture and/or outcomes of schooling. Year-around schooling calendars, the “no-excuses” charter school model, and No Child Left Behind’s annual yearly progress (AYP) mandates and turnaround models are examples of this. These and other types of ambitious school improvement interventions and approaches are not incompatible with developing capabilities for practice (as, often, their success in some ways depends on the development of such capabilities); however, developing capabilities has often been given much less emphasis among the school reform and research communities.

organizations. The purpose of these partnerships is to assist schools in understanding and using externally developed supports for practice, both formal and social, in order to develop new capabilities throughout the school. By "formal supports for practice," I mean "first-principles" as well as "hard" resources that codify existing knowledge (e.g., in materials, documents, technology) to help define and guide practice.⁵ By "social supports for practice," I mean resources that define and guide practice through personal interactions and professional exchanges (e.g., teams, work groups, coaching, and mentoring).

More needs to be known about externally supported approaches to developing capabilities for practice and what it means to do this type of work on the ground. Thus, the purpose of this study is to increase understanding of external assistance providers' approaches to developing capabilities through coordinating formal and social supports for practice. The study focuses specifically on understanding an externally supported approach to creating new capabilities for schoolwide behavioral management. The study involves a comparative case study of a schoolwide, classroom-level intervention supporting the implementation of Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS), an approach to improving schoolwide behavioral management capabilities currently supported by federal and state policy. The focus of this study is the design and implementation of a commercially developed program (*Developmental Designs*) for addressing a component of PBIS (called "Tier 1 Interventions and Supports") in the middle grades. This study has potential to extend a more general understanding of what is required to create other kinds of (large-scale) capabilities for practice (e.g., instructional practice) in schools.

This study builds upon and extends an ongoing research study conducted by faculty in the Combined Program in Education and Psychology (CPEP) at the School of Education (UM-SOE) at The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. The aforementioned study centers on the implementation of *Developmental Designs* (DD) in three St. Paul/Minneapolis middle schools (Jagers & Kwame-Ross, 2013) and one UM-SOE partnership (middle) school.

I begin with an analysis of the need for (and challenges of) developing capabilities for practice in U.S. schools, after which I develop an analytic framework for critically examining the use of coordinated formal and social supports for practice to develop capabilities. I continue with

⁵ By "first-principles" I mean a category of support involving the implicit/explicit transmission of the broad premises, postulates and goals informing design.

a review of the literature on PBIS to discern what is currently known about (a) the role of state-level networks and externally developed classroom management programs and (b) the use of formal and social supports in creating new capabilities for practices that support schoolwide behavior management. Based on my analytic framework and review of research, I then nominate research questions and propose a study design for answering them.

Critical Analysis

The demands of outcomes-based, ambitious school improvement are supported through the development of requisite capabilities for practice. However, doing so has proven difficult due to a host of challenges emanating both from within schools and from their external environments. Despite these challenges, theoretical and empirical research (largely from investigations of instructional improvement as described below) provide evidence that partnerships between schools and external assistance providers, centered around the use of formal and social supports for practice, are a viable strategy for developing schoolwide capabilities for practice. While there is some empirical knowledge of how to build capabilities for instruction (through externally supported designs for practice), there is less known about how to build capabilities for schoolwide behavior management. This is the case despite schoolwide behavior management being a key component of instructional improvement.

Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) is an evidenced-based "tiered framework" for guiding the redesign of a school's ecology in order to alter adult practices and student behavior. By "tiered framework," I mean a multi-layered system of intervention typically consisting of three tiers increasing in intensity of supports.

Research on PBIS and statewide implementation efforts point to the need to know more about how external assistance providers (such as commercial programs and interventions) go about building capabilities for school-level leadership, internal coaching, and teaching practice related to classroom-based behavior management. Knowing more about these types of capabilities, in turn, has the potential to inform more general discussions about supporting the development of a broader array of capabilities in schools (including instructional capabilities).

The General Problem: The Need for (and Challenges of) Developing Capabilities

Over half a century of American school reform activity has resulted in a mixed bag at best. On one hand, reform efforts have been increasingly effective in altering the policy, legislative and institutional landscapes of schooling vis-à-vis school restructuring legislation,

rapid expansion of charter schools, and growth of portfolio districts. On the other hand, reform efforts have shown comparatively weak effects on actual practices, norms, and outcomes of urban schooling (Payne, 2008). These realities point to the need to place more emphasis on practice-based reform(s) and the development of requisite capabilities for practice. However, a number of challenges, both internal and external to schools, have complicated efforts to successfully engage in this type of school improvement work.

The weak effects of school reform on practice (and outcomes) can be attributed to such issues as: an emphasis on replicating organizational structures, technologies, and culture absent complementary attention to instruction; a lack of strong guidance for the practice of leaders and teachers; resistance to detailed guidance for practice by leaders and teachers; and an absence of strong designs for supporting professional learning in pursuit of changed practice (Glazer & Peurach, 2015; Peurach et al., 2014). In other words, as Peurach et al. (2014) suggest, school reform efforts have consistently lacked focus on defining, creating, and developing individuals' *capabilities* to co-enact their roles effectively with respect to the demands of ambitious reform agenda.

School improvement that requires practitioners to perform in ways that are foreign and challenging risk being in conflict with school officials' existing knowledge, beliefs, and behavior: what they know, what they believe, and ways in which they perform. School improvement, as a result, also requires higher levels of organization, expertise and commitment on behalf of schools themselves (i.e. as organizations).

Without a focus on building capabilities for practice, schools, school leaders, and teachers are left to define, create, and develop new capabilities on their own. However, doing so is unlikely, given that deviating from current practice places challenges and demands (such as those described above) on schools and their personnel. This is especially the case in chronically underperforming schools, where both initial capabilities and the conditions for developing new capabilities are weak and/or nonexistent and where the risk of regression to past practice is strong (Bryk et al., 1999; Cohen et al., 2013; Payne, 2008; Peurach, 2011). Importantly, where capabilities do not already exist and schools are unable to generate them on their own, reform efforts run an increased risk of failing.

In sum, much of what is required to drastically improve schools is dependent on creating and developing capabilities for practice, and doing so has been an ongoing challenge. The

difficulty surrounding this critical aspect of improving schools is explained, in part, by three existing challenges. Each of the following challenges is either a cause of, or further exacerbates, schools' inability to direct and coordinate the work of their personnel, an important corollary to changing practice:

- The (often overwhelming) demands for and constraints surrounding developing capabilities for practice;
- Unclear signals emanating from the reform environment; and
- Lack of agreement and know-how.

First, deeply entrenched social, economic, and environmental constraints negatively impact efforts to define and develop capabilities for practice (Payne, 2008; Peurach, 2011). As would be expected, the need and pressure to improve are very high in chronically underperforming schools. Yet these are the very schools that are often plagued by a lack of pro-social norms; a lack of ingrained value for education; high levels of poverty and violence; poor parent involvement and academic press; lack of resources; transient students; underprepared, ineffective, and mobile leadership and staff; and perpetually dangerous and professionally toxic school cultures (Payne, 2008). These conditions place a huge burden on schools to engage in frequent and non-routine problem solving to address issues for which they lack not only direct influence but also sufficient resources, expertise, and organizational capital. In other words, both the demands for and constraints surrounding developing capabilities for practice are often overwhelming in these contexts.

Second, clear signals regarding exactly which capabilities need to be created are often lacking. The lack of clear signals is due, in part, to the structure, policies, and inadequacies emanating from the larger school reform environment (Cohen & Moffitt, 2010; Cohen & Spillane, 1992; Payne, 2008). As previously mentioned, school reform has historically focused on policies, programs, and structures (e.g., standards and standardized tests, school restructuring mandates and various products from the growing commercial education industry) rather than on defining, developing, and diffusing specific capabilities for practice. Many of these policies and programs are disconnected from the realities of schooling, especially in high-risk contexts (Payne, 2008). Furthermore, schools are also inundated with school reform goals, some of which may conflict (e.g., increased graduation rates and rigorous academic standards), and all of which compete with one another for priority and often-scarce resources. These realities have resulted in

many schools approaching improvement efforts in an uncoordinated, if not half-hearted, fashion despite the need for comprehensiveness, integration, and alignment (Bryk et al., 2010; Cohen et al., 2013; Peurach, 2011).

Third, researchers and practitioners lack agreement on (and knowledge about) how to build capabilities for practice. Research and theory on school improvement often focus on two approaches to school improvement, at times represented as being at opposing ends of the continuum of school change strategies. On one end is the “top-down” approach, which relies heavily on external, bureaucratic guidance and decision-making. On the other is the “bottom-up” approach, which strongly supports leveraging and relying on internal, professional expertise from practitioners (e.g., teachers, school-level leaders).

Reform initiatives have included both approaches. However, both approaches have had limited success in coordinating the work of school personnel and, as a result, have had limited success in building schoolwide and/or large-scale capabilities for practice.

Schools have been perceived as being averse to both external and internal efforts at coordination. For instance, several scholars of school organizations (Bidwell, 1965; Glazer & Peurach, 2015; Little, 1986; Lortie, 1975) have echoed Rowan’s (1990) claim that schools and systems of schools are, in fact, “large bureaucracies without strict bureaucratic controls and highly professional organizations that lack collegial forms of collaboration and control” (Rowan, 1990, p. 354).

The lack of internal and external controls is explained, in part, by uncertainty and complexity inherent in the work of educating students, coupled with professional norms surrounding practice. Coordinating the work of school personnel requires a well-articulated and accepted knowledge base involving a theory of action, beliefs and values, language, and shared practices. This type of coherence, however, has largely eluded the field of education (Cohen, 2011; Hiebert et al., 2002). Having a well-articulated and accepted knowledge base for education is made difficult (though not impossible) by a number of factors inherent in American education, including: (a) many competing and uncoordinated constituencies and goals; (b) variability in students’ needs and abilities; (c) unpredictability inherent in educating children; and (d) imperfect teaching methods coupled with unpredictable learning results (Shedd & Bacharach, 1991). On the other hand, much of it is also attributable to professional norms governing the teaching profession, such as privacy, isolation, and discretion (Little, 1986). These norms alone

make schools averse to both internal (i.e., collegial/professional) and external (i.e., bureaucratic) coordination (Little, 1986).

Solution/Redress: Building Capabilities Through Formal and Social Supports for Practice

Despite these intertwined challenges, one way to begin thinking about how to develop capabilities for practice is through the use of externally developed formal *and* social supports for practice. Due to their ties to opposing perspectives on the nature of schooling (and school improvement), formal and social supports have been viewed as diametrically opposed and mutually exclusive approaches to developing capabilities for practice. However, an emergent perspective-informed by research and theory on schools as organizations, the nature of teaching and its improvement, and comprehensive school reform research-considers formal and social supports for practice as interdependent, mutually reinforcing aspects of practice-focused interventions.

Formal supports for practice. One approach to creating capabilities for practice has been to leverage existing knowledge of what to do and how to do it. This approach often attempts to do so through the transmission and exploitation of externally developed designs as a strategy for school-level learning and change.⁶

Formal supports for practice can be defined as resources in which existing knowledge has been codified for the purposes of defining, guiding, coordinating, monitoring and/or evaluating the work of members of an organization (Alder & Borys, 1996; Glazer & Peurach, 2015; Pentland & Feldman, 2003). These supports can range from first-principles on one end to what might commonly be known as “scripts” on the other. Whereas the (sole) use of first-principles emphasizes transmitting underlying, basic design premises, scripts emphasize adherence to heavily specified behavioral and cognitive routines.

Rather than insisting on *either* first-principle *or* scripts, most of these approaches relying heavily on formal supports leverage a wide array of “hard” formal supports, emphasizing intelligent fidelity to more comprehensive, externally created designs as a strategy for building capabilities.⁷ In addition to scripts and first-principles, other types of formal supports for practice

⁶ One example in education reform is the work of the Comprehensive School Reform provider, Success for All (SFA) and its use of specified lesson plans, organizational structures and roles, routines, etc. (see Peurach, 2011).

⁷ *Intelligent* fidelity is adherence to design and an implementation guidance when doing so makes sense (given localized conditions (e.g., constraints, opportunities)) and appropriately adapting designs when necessary.

include material, technological and/or temporal artifacts that embody the “designed organization” (Spillane et al., 2011). Examples of formal supports for practice include: “formally designated positions, chains of command, departments, programs... formal organizational routines,” procedures, policies, protocols/forms, and calendars (Spillane et al., 2011, p. 3).⁸

Formal supports for practice carry both affordances and limitations as they relate to creating capabilities for practice. One affordance is that by codifying knowledge, skill, and guidance for practice, they enable practitioners to perform in more desirable, predictable, and uniform ways (Alder & Borys, 1996; Spillane & Zoltners, 2011). Another affordance is that formal supports for practice tend to outlast potentially consequential organizational shifts such as turnovers in leadership and staff (Spillane et al., 2011). In doing so, the use of formal supports for practice make the development and maintenance of important aspects of school improvement, such as organizational stability and continuity, more likely. Lastly, by utilizing externally developed formal supports for practice, schools (and teachers) avoid the need to engage in the often time consuming, iterative, and intellectually demanding work of designing resources for themselves. Schooling in general, and school reform in particular, has relied heavily on formal supports for practice. Some of these formal supports include standards and standardized testing, policy, materials, structures, teaching routines, and formal programs.

The affordances of formal supports for practice in creating capabilities are contingent on their effective design, use, and interaction with other relevant resources (Cohen et al., 2003; Spillane & Diamond, 2004). For instance, the provision of formal supports guarantees neither that they will be used as planned nor adapted or altered effectively. In fact, schools (and teachers) have a history of ignoring, misunderstanding, and mal-adapting resources (Cohen et al., 2003; Glazer & Peurach, 2015).⁹ These occurrences are partly explained by the fact that effective use of new resources often calls for requisite know-how and skills that are weak, particularly in chronically underperforming schools. Furthermore, even the most well-designed resources must be adapted to fit local contexts and undergo redesign as problems and opportunities on the ground change.

⁸ The use of formal supports for practice in planned change has deep roots in the literatures on organizational studies, organizational routines and school improvement.

⁹ Teacher resistance to strong, detailed guidance is attributed to, in part, many viewing it as a source of deskilling and deprofessionalization.

Social supports for practice. Another approach to creating capabilities for practice is through exploiting the individual and collective expertise and ongoing problem-solving of organizational members. Instead of relying on formalized resources, this approach attempts to structure and exploit professional collaborations in an effort to guide *site-based* learning and design.¹⁰

Categories of social supports for practice—designed and incidental—correspond to interdisciplinary theoretical and empirical research on formal and informal *social* learning paradigms.¹¹ Professional collaborations that attempt to leverage and improve upon practitioners’ expertise and problem-solving can range from mandatory training and workshops (formal), to instructional coaching (between formal and informal), to incidental professional exchanges between peers (informal) (Eraut, 2004; Lohman, 2000; Rex, 2000; Wilson & Berne, 2009). Although interdisciplinary research on professional learning uses the terms “formal” and “informal” to describe different types of social supports, I will use the terms “designed” and “incidental” for the purposes of maintaining conceptual clarity, where possible. As with formal supports, the use of social supports for practice carries both affordances and limitations for creating capabilities for practice.

Social supports for practice focus on the use of individuals and groups of people as the primary resources for creating and exchanging knowledge (Rensick, 2010). According to Rowan (1990), common characteristics of social supports for practice include attempts to: (a) redesign teacher roles in ways that facilitate the development of network structures to support teacher learning and decision making, (b) promote teacher collaboration and teaming, and (c) include communal rather than hierarchical forms of organization to achieve organizational integration (p. 369).¹²

Social supports for practice include variations of what is referred to traditionally as “communities of practice” (Brown & Druguid, 1991). A simple definition of communities of

¹⁰ Examples of this approach to improvement in education include popularizing/movement towards site-based management (SBM), partnerships between university and K-12 in the form of professional development schools (PDS), professional learning communities (PLCs) and teacher-leadership.

¹¹ Researchers note that while dichotomizing learning and supports this way is difficult if not problematic (Eraut, 2000; Jurasaitė-Harbison & Rex, 2010), it is analytically useful.

¹² This view of social supports for practice draws from the various literatures related to organizational learning, communities of practice, and organic (vs. mechanistic) approaches to organizing.

practice is: groups of people engaging in a joint enterprise where collective knowledge concerning “what to do” and “how to do it” is transmitted and modified as a result of engaging in that joint enterprise (Brown & Druguid, 1991; Lave & Wenger, 1998). In education, two of the most popularized variations of the communities of practice concept are “professional learning communities” (PLCs) and coaching.

Characteristics common to PLCs include groups of similar teachers (e.g., content area or grade-level) coming together to describe, critique, study, and improve collective practice toward a common goal. With coaching, individual or groups of teachers work collaboratively with a more expert peer to improve teaching practice. Components of coaching considered essential among various coaching models include: opportunities to practice new skills; frequent observations; performance feedback (can include reflection, discussion); modeling/demonstration (e.g., skill instruction, co-teaching); positive, supportive coach-teacher relationship (e.g., providing emotional support); and joint-planning/collaborative goal-setting/problem-solving (Grierson & Gallagher 2009; Joyce & Showers 2002; Wallace et al., 2008).¹³

Other well-known examples of social supports for practice in schools include: teacher-led subject, grade-level, and school improvement departments/committees, team-teaching, peer observation/evaluation, instructional coaching, job-embedded professional development, and mentoring/apprenticeship.

Like formal supports, social supports for practice also carry potential as well as limitations for improving capabilities. First, social supports are both an enabler and byproduct of professional community (i.e. shared norms, values, and common work coupled with frequent interactions focused on the improvement of practice). Several aspects of professional community, such as the deprivatization of practice, peer collaboration, shared expertise, joint problem-solving, new member socialization, and common language are important resources in

¹³ Due to the importance placed by the implementation science literature on coaching and the increase of coaching in K-12 education, it is necessary to understand a bit about typical coaching models employed. Four approaches to coaching in K-12 schools have been popularized: peer, cognitive, literacy and instructional (Cornett & Knight, 2008; Knight, 2009). As with all coaching models, these approaches differ in their respective goals and the methods used to achieve them. While instructional coaching focuses on helping teachers to implement research-based instructional practices in their classrooms, literacy coaching focuses on doing so in the content areas of reading and writing, specifically. And whereas peer coaching is distinguished by its use of current teachers (i.e. “peers”), cognitive coaching is distinguished by its focus on teacher thinking (i.e. cognitive) and shaping teacher attitudes and skills in reflective practice.

developing capabilities for practice within and across schools (Bulkley & Hicks, 2005). Second, the decisions and designs for practice emerging from professional collaboration(s) often result in higher levels of contextual “fit” and initial commitment on the part of practitioners (Bulkley & Hicks, 2005; Halverson, 2003).

Despite the affordances of social supports, (over)relying on them in efforts to create capabilities places a high demand on initial capabilities (e.g., organizational structure, resources, professional culture, know-how). For example, the effectiveness of social supports for practice is enabled and constrained by the provision (or lack thereof) of unifying frameworks for action (e.g., common language and performance standards). Secondly, these types of supports require intensive resources such as time and commitment on the part of participants and the organization itself (Glazer & Peurach, 2015). Also, these resources are lacking in most American schools and especially in chronically underperforming schools. Moreover, social supports for practice are unlikely to develop on their own and are difficult to sustain once created, due to professional norms (e.g., autonomy, privacy, egalitarianism) that act to undermine them (Little, 1990), and due to high rates of personnel transiency in underperforming schools (e.g., "brain drain" as a consequence of teacher and leader mobility). As a result, relying on social supports for practice in developing capabilities absent other supports increases the likelihood of failure in schools where initial capabilities are likely weak.

Designed (formal) vs. incidental (informal) social supports. Interdisciplinary research conceives of social supports for professional learning as existing on a continuum of formality (Eraut, 2004; Lohman, 2000). According to this perspective, the exploitation of expertise and problem solving can occur in at least two ways. One way is through prescribed professional interactions. Here, professional learning opportunities tend to be structured or preplanned, occur in a formal setting and involve learning with or from an “expert other.” The other way is to exploit expertise and problem solving through more organic, incidental professional interactions and exchanges.¹⁴

Dichotomizing social supports for practice in these ways allows for the surfacing and investigation of a richer array of school-based social supports for building capabilities for

¹⁴ Informal learning is less constrained than formal learning in that “unlike formal learning, informal learning can be either planned or unplanned structured or unstructured” (Lohrman, 2000, p. 84). Eraut further describes the “characteristics of the informal end of the continuum of formality” as “*implicit, unintended, opportunistic* and *unstructured* learning and the absence of a teacher” (emphasis added, p. 168).

practice, including those that might otherwise go undocumented. As Wilson & Berne (1999) aptly summarize, this is particularly important in the field of education:

Some learning, no doubt, goes on in the interstices of the workday, in conversations with colleagues, passing glimpses of another teacher's classroom...tips swapped in the coffee lounge...While workshop opportunities have been criticized for being decontextualized and contrived...these other opportunities for teacher learning (while they may be more authentic) are happenstance, random, and unpredictable. In sum, teacher learning has traditionally been a patchwork of opportunities – formal and informal, mandatory and voluntary, serendipitous and planned...As a field, we know very little about what teachers learn across those multiple opportunities...Hence, across this incoherent and cobbled-together nonsystem, structured and unstructured, formal and informal, we have little sense—save the collective and negative self-reports of generations of teachers about traditional in-service programs—of what exactly it is that teachers learn and by what mechanisms that learning takes place. What knowledge do teachers acquire these experiences? How does that knowledge improve their practice? These questions are left unanswered (p. 174).

Furthermore, as research indicates that “teachers co-construct their understandings of innovations by informally collaborating and learning from each other through reflection on their experience,” recognizing social supports for practice as both designed and incidental (or formal and informal) provides important analytic affordances for investigating the ways in which capabilities for practice are developed in support of external designs (Jurasaitė-Harbison & Rex, 2010, p. 168).

Integration of formal and social supports for practice. Despite the affordances and limitations of both, mutually exclusive perspectives on the use of formal and social supports for practice have predominated until fairly recently. These perspectives can be grouped into two camps: those supporting formal supports for practice and those supporting social supports for practice. These opposing perspectives are tied to historic debates regarding the nature of teaching (e.g., routine vs. complex) and, by extension, approaches to its improvement (e.g., bureaucratic vs. professional).¹⁵ Nevertheless, research on large-scale, schoolwide instructional improvement

¹⁵ On one side are those who view teaching as a routine task whose improvement depends on bureaucratic guidance in the form of prescribed goals (e.g., standards) linked to prescribed, formalized resources (e.g., materials,

points to a more inclusive understanding of both types of supports. This research perspective suggests that coordinating and integrating *both* formal and social supports, as part of an externally supported approach to improvement, may be critical to developing capabilities for practice.

Notwithstanding the divergent perspectives on, and challenges surrounding, creating capabilities for practice, several lines of research document successful attempts at doing this work schoolwide. Investigations of successful approaches to building instructional capabilities point to an interdependent relationship between formal and social supports for practice (Cohen et al., 2013; Glazer & Peurach, 2015; Peurach et al., 2014). Thus, the emergent perspective acknowledges “the *complementary* use of social and material resources,” recognizing the relationship between them as symbiotic and critical to any comprehensive, coherent intervention (emphasis added, Lampert et al., 2011, p. 1383).

Several empirical and theoretical sources involving the coordinated use of formal and social supports for practice in successful attempts to develop instructional capabilities are worth noting. Due to its scope, one key empirical source is the Study of Instructional Improvement (SII) (Rowan & Miller, 2007; Rowan et al., 2009). The SII was a four-year quasi-experiment investigating the design, implementation and effects of three Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) programs (Accelerated Schools Project, America’s Choice and Success for All). A common characteristic of these three CSRs involved taking the whole school as the unit of intervention. Perhaps more important than the unit of intervention was the researchers’ use of externally developed, robust formal and social supports to develop instructional capabilities.

Lampert’s (2012) analyses of the use of externally developed resources from three instructional guidance systems—Success for All (included in the above study), Montessori, and Reading Recovery—describes “the coupling between social structures and materials” as a common feature. Furthermore, in these systems, while formal supports for practice were “continuously developed and refined through available social means,” social supports for practice were “heavily used because they support[ed] the understanding and adaptation of usable materials” (Lampert et al., 2011, p. 1383). In this way, Lampert and colleagues (2011) describe

structures, programs, teaching routines); on the other side are those who view teaching as uncertain and complex work (non-routine) reliant on professional guidance by way of leveraging practitioners’ expertise and joint problem-solving (Rowan, 1990).

the relationship between formal and social supports for practice as giving “rise to and sustaining the other” (Lampert et al., 2011, p. 1383).

The success of developing capabilities for practice through the coordinated use of externally developed formal and social supports is supported in the broader literature on school improvement. For instance, Bulkley and Hicks’ (2005) study of three educational management organizations (EMO) found that the highest degree of professional community in schools was found in and facilitated by the EMO with the most prescriptive designs for classroom practice (and organizational structure). Furthermore, James Spillane and several of his colleagues have conducted studies of schoolwide reform in a number of urban elementary schools in Chicago. These studies found that formal supports for practice (e.g., materials, programs, and designed routines) made classroom practice(s) more standardized and transparent. This in turn led to conditions for the transformation of norms, culture, and professional community (Halverson, 2003; Sherer & Spillane, 2011; Spillane & Zoltners, 2011).

Lastly, Resnick (2010) describes the success of an intervention in two large school districts that “explicitly combined instructional tools and routines with professional development strategies aimed at building professional community” (p. 193). These studies provide further evidence of the generative, mutually interdependent relationship between formal and social supports as well as their importance to developing capabilities for practice.

A Particular Case: Creating Behavioral Management Capabilities through PBIS

The proceeding analysis functions as a framework for both thinking critically about and investigating approaches to developing capabilities for practice. More needs to be known not only about creating instructional capabilities, but other types of capabilities for practice, as well. One potentially fruitful area for exploration, given its importance to a number of reform efforts (instruction, reculturing, safety, equity) and the scarcity of research surrounding it, is the development of schoolwide capabilities for behavioral management.

Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) is a schoolwide, evidence-based framework that guides the redesign of a school’s ecology in an effort to create and develop capabilities for behavioral management practice. PBIS is important because, like successful, large-scale approaches to creating instructional capabilities, it involves partnerships between schools and external assistance providers around the use of externally developed formal and social supports for practice. Furthermore, many reform efforts (e.g., equity, safety) and other

types of capabilities (e.g., instruction) are tied to teachers' and schools' abilities to effectively manage student behavior.

Tier 1 (primary, schoolwide, and/or universal supports) is critical to PBIS design and implementation and often requires substantial shifts in schools' organizational and work philosophies and practices. Not unlike other widely adopted interventions (e.g., CSR, Response to Intervention, Reading Recovery), external support networks have taken a leading role in PBIS implementation and scale-up.¹⁶ Research on PBIS, statewide implementation of Tier 1 and classroom management program implementation point to a need to learn more about how classroom management programs go about coordinating the use of formal and social supports for practice in the development of specific capabilities for classroom management across interconnected roles (e.g., teachers, coaches, leaders, teams).

Overview of PBIS. PBIS is a well-known and widely adopted approach to creating schoolwide behavioral capabilities in schools. Barrett et al. (2008) define it as a “whole school prevention strategy that alters the school environment by creating improved systems (e.g., discipline, reinforcement, and data management) and procedures (e.g., collection of office referral data, training, team-based decision making) to promote positive changes in student and teacher behaviors” (p. 105). Consisting of a 3-tiered framework leveraged as a whole-school intervention, PBIS guides the redesign of schooling environments (e.g., norms, policies, systems structures, practices and interactions with home and community environments). The purpose of redesigning school environments is to enable school personnel to continuously define, standardize, and teach behavioral expectations, as well as respond to infractions with greater predictability, effectiveness, and proactivity.

Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports' evidence-based “technology” or comprehensive framework has roots in applied science, systems change, and environmental redesign (Horner et al., 2010). The supporting infrastructure surrounding PBIS is rather extensive and includes: federal and state legislation, a peer-reviewed journal, state and local networks, national organizations, conferences, and professional consultants.¹⁷ As previously

¹⁶ CSR was not a single intervention but, instead, a class of interventions.

¹⁷ There are more than 18,000 schools in all 50 states at some phase of adoption or implementation of PBIS according to a 2013 report by The OESP Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports.

stated, research supports that high-fidelity PBIS schools are successful in creating preventative, proactive, and systemic approaches to behavior management (Bradshaw et al., 2009). This in turn leads to reduced student infractions, better school climates and cultures, and increased achievement (Bradshaw et al., 2009).

The PBIS framework consist of three tiers which increase in intensity of supports, the last two of which are meant to address behaviors of students unresponsive (i.e., non-responders) to the supports and interventions provided by the preceding tier(s). Interchangeable names have been given to each tier, all of which signify the tier's level and/or intensity at which it is implemented. Tier 1 is also known as Primary, Universal, and/or Schoolwide; Tier 2 is also known as Secondary, Targeted, and/or Group; and Tier 3, is also known as Tertiary, Intensive, and/or Individualized. A description of each tier follows below:

- Tier 1 supports and interventions are “primary/universal/schoolwide” in that they target the school as an organization (including the entire school body) and are meant to be effective for at least 85 percent of all students (Horner et al., 2010). They include supports such as standardized school rules, classroom rules, and consequence and reward systems.
- Tier 2 supports and interventions target small groups of students with common misbehavior that persists despite Tier 1 implementation (5-10 percent of students) (Horner et al., 2010). They include small group interventions such as peer mentoring, reteaching behavioral expectations, behavioral plans, and prepackaged intervention programs.
- Tier 3 interventions and supports target students with chronic misbehavior that persists despite the combination of schoolwide (Tier 1) and group supports (Tier 2) (up to 5% of students) (Horner et al., 2010). Because these supports and interventions are more individualized, Tier 3 supports are difficult to preconceive but include various wraparound services provided to students and their families (e.g., individualized behavior plans, counseling, family/parenting interventions, social services, etc.).

PBIS functions at the highest levels (states, intermediate school districts (ISDs), local districts) and lowest levels (schools, classrooms) of educational systems. Most state departments

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) in 1997 and amended in 2004; Michigan's Integrated Behavior and Learning Support Initiative (MiBLSi); Association for Positive Behavior Support (APBS); Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions.

of education (SEAs) play a pivotal role in key aspects of PBIS including adoption, implementation, evaluation and funding. State-level initiatives focused on creating and diffusing supports for district- and schoolwide behavioral management are currently underway in more than 40 states (Muller, 2007). These states have created (or helped to create) state, regional, district and school level capacity-building systems and resources to enable implementation at scale, particularly at Tier 1. In part, due to their focus on creating regional and district-wide capabilities (along with sustainability, cost, and contextual concerns), state-level networks appear to have a comparatively smaller focus, influence, and knowledge about the specifics of PBIS implementation at the classroom level (i.e. classroom-based PBIS).

In addition to states, a number of externally developed programs also exist to support the implementation of PBIS. Commercially developed classroom organization and management programs abound. Among the more popular programs are Assertive Discipline, CHAMPS (an approach developed by Safe and Civil Schools) and Responsive Classroom while the most researched and successful programs include The Incredible Years (IY) and the Good Behavior Game (GBG) (Nolan et al., 2014; Poduska & Kurki, 2014; Reinke 2012; Reinke et al., 2014; Shernoff & Kratochwill, 2007; Webster-Stratton, 2011; Wehby, 2012). Some of these programs, and others, predate the scale-up of PBIS, and external programs have generally been instrumental in PBIS implementation (particularly at Tiers 2 and 3). Furthermore, externally supported programs can function in interaction with, and in lieu of, state support. That is, even where state support is strong, externally supported programs can help operationalize aspects of PBIS by providing more detailed guidance and support. Alternatively, externally developed programs can also fill the vacuum created by weak state support.

Criticality of Tier 1 supports. While PBIS has depended heavily on the support of states, it aims to effect fundamental change in the day-to-day work at the lowest levels of the system: regular classrooms. Tier 1 places a large demand on the development of capabilities, as it requires a marked shift in schools' and teachers' behavioral management structures, philosophies and practices. Furthermore, Tier 1 supports (e.g., structures, practices, capabilities, policies) are critical to the efficacious design, implementation and desired outcomes of subsequent tiers and, thus, PBIS as a whole. The research reviewed below supports that the importance of Tier 1 is especially true with respect to classroom-level PBIS (classroom management).

As is often the case with newly adopted evidence-based practices, PBIS requires school staff to work in new ways, thus requiring the development of capabilities for practice.¹⁸ Each tier in PBIS requires (to some degree) the development of a set of differentiated capabilities, many of which are outside the established norms and practices of most schools. However, research points to Tier 1 capabilities as foundational to the success of PBIS (Lohrmann et al., 2008; Kincaid et al., 2007; Tyre et al., 2010).

The criticality of developing Tier 1 capabilities is particularly well supported by two reports on two statewide implementation efforts. These reports imply that the importance of Tier 1 is explained, in part, by the fact that shoddy Tier 1 design and implementation threaten to derail PBIS as a holistic intervention. For instance, representatives from Michigan's PBIS network reported that effective design and implementation of Tier 1 "results in a more valid, manageable, and cost effective system of supports at the secondary and tertiary levels" (Spotlight, 2012, p. 3). In research on Maryland's statewide implementation efforts, Barrett et al. (2008) echo the sentiments above:

Our success in Maryland is likely due to our commitment to establishing a sound universal system of support. In fact, the state has focused on building a statewide PBIS infrastructure from the universal system or "green-zone" up. We can build on this stable universal schoolwide behavior support system when establishing secondary and tertiary systems... This investment in the universal systems of support and behavior support coaches has resulted in a sustainable schoolwide PBIS infrastructure and the scaffolding of future school-based prevention efforts (p. 113).

Research points to three reasons underlining the importance of Tier 1. First, Tier I likely represents the most drastic shift in schools and school staffs' past practice, especially in chronically underperforming schools. For example, Tier 1 requires schools and staff to: (a) generate commitment and buy-in; (b) form a high-functioning PBIS leadership team; (c) establish a data collection system; (d) establish and teach all behavior expectations to students; (e) design and enact systems for positive reinforcement as well as predictable consequence systems for behavior infractions; and (f) engage in data-based decision making (Michigan

¹⁸ Key aspects of PBIS, for instance, such as standardized behavioral expectations and consequence (including meaningful alternatives to suspension) and reward systems, high-functioning team-based leadership/decision making, ongoing data analysis followed by the redesign if supports/interventions, functional behavioral assessment, wraparound services, school-home behavioral co-planning are weak in most schools and likely weak to nonexistent in chronically underperforming schools.

Department of Education, PBIS Implementation Guide, 2010, p. 6). Much of the difficulty in managing student behavior (and the associated consequence) is, in fact, attributable to the weakness or nonexistence of these very characteristics and capabilities in schools (Walker et al., 1996).

Second, weak Tier 1 design and implementation threaten to overwhelm the resources (and morale) of PBIS schools. Tier 1 supports and interventions are supposed to be effective for no fewer than 85% of students. Thus, one goal of Tier 1 is to constrain the need for subsequent supports to all but a small number of students (1%-15%) (Barrett et al., 2008). Limiting the numbers of students requiring Tier 2 and Tier 3 (in particular) supports is important, as these tiers require more resources, expertise, and adaptive problem-solving (Spotlight, 2012). This is a particularly important point for underperforming schools where the frequency of behavior issues is highest and resources for dealing with them lowest.

On this point, recent research points to classroom management as the most critical aspect of Tier 1 as well as PBIS implementation, student outcomes and sustainability. As a result, it has been suggested that researchers and practitioners interested in enhancing PBIS sustainability (Mathew et al., 2014) target this tier. For example, Mathews et al. (2014) study of reports from personnel from 261 schools found that subscales related to classroom-level PBIS were stronger predictors of schoolwide PBIS implementation three years after adoption than both schoolwide and non-classroom subscales. As the authors aptly explain, these findings:

... may be somewhat surprising to general audiences but is supported by the theory that the actions of individual teachers are most important to sustainability. Students spend the vast majority of their school day in the classroom. As core PBIS implementers, classroom teachers have regular and ongoing opportunities to implement PBIS practices in their classrooms by creating environments that increase the likelihood of students learning academic and behavioral skills. Although PBIS is a schoolwide approach, the quality and durability of implementation may be contingent on the extent to which individual teachers implement PBIS classroom practices with high fidelity (Mathews et al., 2014, p. 173).

Third, the capabilities associated with Tier 1 supports and interventions are leveraged in subsequent tiers. For instance, designing (or choosing from a menu of options) both group and individualized supports presuppose the existence of Tier 1 supports such as data management

systems and routines, teaming structures and commonly enforced behavior expectations. Therefore, effectively designing and implementing Tier 2 and Tier 3 are dependent on first doing so for Tier 1.

The relationship between universal SEL programs and Tier 1 PBIS.¹⁹ Several SEL programs and interventions (discussed in the following section) have been used to support Tier 1 PBIS implementation. SEL views the acquisition and development of social and emotional skills as foundational to positive, prosocial behavior (Jones et al., 2014). SEL's approach differs in other, important ways from PBIS (as well as traditional approaches to classroom management). However, the strengths and weaknesses of SEL and PBIS make them complementary approaches to classroom management.

SEL is the process of developing five sets of cognitive, affective, and behavioral competency clusters that relate to intrapersonal and/or interpersonal domains. These five competency clusters include: self-awareness (intrapersonal), self-management (intrapersonal), social awareness (intrapersonal), relationship skills (intrapersonal) and responsible decision-making (inter- and intra- personal).²⁰

SEL's approach to classroom management emphasizes the use of preventative and proactive strategies (e.g., routines, structures, classroom organization, etc.) and building students' social and emotional intra- and interpersonal skills, rather than the use of reactive strategies (e.g., punitive consequences). Furthermore, because effective classroom management requires both knowledge about children's behavior and development and the use of evidence-based strategies, researchers encourage the use of high-quality SEL programs that meet both of these demands (Domitrovich et al., 2015; Jones et al., 2014).

PBIS and SEL share several important similarities and differences. In terms of similarities, PBIS and SEL are universal interventions, support the use of evidence-based

¹⁹ Social and emotional learning (SEL) is defined as “the process through which children and adults acquire and effectively apply the knowledge, attitudes, and skills necessary to understand and manage emotions, set and achieve positive goals, feel and show empathy for others, establish and maintain positive relationships, and make responsible decisions” (CASEL Guide, 2015, p. 5).

²⁰ According to CASEL, approaches to developing SEL competencies include: infusing SEL in teaching practices (e.g., the Developmental Designs approach), infusing SEL instruction into an academic curriculum, creating policies and organizational structures that support students' SEL development, and directly teaching SEL skills in free-standing lessons (p. 7). A meta analysis of 213 studies of SEL in schools in addition to increased academic performance, outcomes related to discipline included: better classroom behavior, decreased disruptive class behavior, noncompliance and disciplinary referrals (Durlak et al., 2011).

strategies, focus on the prevention of problem behaviors, encourage the participation of all stakeholders, and are well-supported by rich theoretical and research bases (Osher; et al., 2010; Bradshaw et al., 2014).

Yet these approaches differ substantively in their theoretical foundations, objectives, and methods. For example, whereas behavioral theory, as found in applied behavioral analysis, is the theoretical foundation of PBIS, SEL draws from a much wider theoretical field, including prevention, resilience, youth development, and several branches of psychology (e.g., positive, developmental, community). Furthermore, the objectives and methods of PBIS and SEL also differ. The objective of PBIS is to redesign the school as an organization, focusing on the creation of systems to manage student behavior. Compared to SEL, PBIS is more adult-centered and uses behavioral techniques (rewards/consequences) to elicit adherence to external school rules. Other methods that PBIS uses include communicating, teaching, monitoring, and reinforcing an explicit set of rules and responses to misbehavior. The objective of SEL, on the other hand, is to develop a set of discrete competencies (self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills and responsible decision making). Its primary focus is on developing students' *internal* capacities to regulate their own behavior and in establishing positive, trusting relationships between teachers and students and between students and their peers (Jones et al, 2014).

Researchers have advocated integrating PBIS and SEL (PBIS+SEL) as a way of addressing the weaknesses and capitalizing on the strengths of each approach in order to, among other things, potentially strengthen the modest effects of both approaches (Jones et al, 2014). For instance, PBIS does not teach social-emotional skills, which are likely important in enabling and constraining student behavior. Despite the fact that SEL does teach these competencies, it has few interventions to manage disruptive behavior when it does occur. In sum, where PBIS would benefit from the adoption of high-quality SEL program curricula and common practices that would add to the consistency and predictability across classroom and school settings (Jones et al, 2014), the PBIS framework (e.g., focus on monitoring, data-based decision making, tiered supports) could be used to make SEL competencies part of schoolwide expectations, guide the selection of SEL programs at each tier, and address students' needs that remain despite universal SEL programming.

What we know about developing capabilities for Tier 1 supports. A reading of the literature on Tier 1 PBIS points to five overarching themes.²¹ One, the research places a heavy emphasis on the use of social supports for practice in creating capabilities in every phase of PBIS. Two, scholars also agree that not enough is known about the day-to-day work of coaches and consultants, including the models and practices employed by them. Three, the literature points to the need to integrate formal and social supports in pursuit of specific capabilities for practice (e.g., team-based functioning and problem solving, and teachers' implementation of praise and precorrection). Four, while this body of work does address the development of certain capabilities of practice, it does not speak to other important capabilities (e.g., administrative leadership, other classroom-based PBIS practices). This deficiency in the research is evident with respect to middle and high schools. And lastly, while the literature on developing capabilities for Tier 1 does focus on externally developed programs (in addition to state-level approaches), empirical studies based on commercially developed programs are scarce.

As stated previously, five themes stand out with respect to what is known (and needs to be known) about the use of formal and social supports in creating capabilities for Tier 1 PBIS. First, there is wide consensus that social supports for practice are key to every phase of PBIS including initial buy-in, ongoing high-fidelity implementation and scale-up (Kincaid et al., 2007; Lohrmann et al., 2008; Lohrmann et al., 2013). A majority of sources (18 of 22) focus to some degree on the use of social supports, especially coaching and external consultation (Benedict et al., 2007; Bradshaw et al., 2008; Carter et al., 2010; Kretlaw & Bartholomew, 2010; Luiselli et al., 2005; Marchant et al., 2010; Stormont et al., 2006).²² While several of these sources focus on social supports for practice as part of an intervention to improve some phase or aspect of PBIS implementation (e.g., initial buy-in, teachers' use of praise and precorrection), a few investigate

²¹ In order to understand approaches to creating capabilities for PBIS, particularly for Tier 1, a search was conducted in the following online databases: ERIC, Education Abstracts and PsycINFO. Variations of the following key search terms were used: "positive behavioral interventions and supports," "positive behavior support," "positive behavior," PBIS, PBS, OR SWPBIS; AND schoolwide, "school wide," Tier 1, primary, OR universal; and implementation or fidelity. In order for an article to be included it had to be an empirical study and, as a result, descriptions of PBIS/PBS, reviews of empirical studies and theoretical pieces were discarded. This yielded a total of approximately 34 sources. The titles, abstracts and keywords of these articles were read in order to identify those that focused on, to some degree, Tier 1. This yielded a total of approximately 22 sources focused on the implementation of Tier 1 interventions and supports.

²² With the exception of two studies, the focal set of literature does not explicitly focus on formal supports for practice. This is the case despite the fact that creating capabilities for PBIS does require leveraging formal supports for practice (e.g., modified office referral forms, codified rules and consequence/incentive systems, and, at times, prescribed programs/interventions).

specific models for coaching and consultation (e.g., train-the-trainer, research-to-intervention model applied to improving teacher fidelity).

Second, many researchers suggest that more needs to be known about the nature of PBIS coaching and consulting, specifically. For instance, while research points to performance feedback as an important component (Benedict, 2007; Fallon et al., 2014; Luiselli et al., 2005; Myers et al., 2011; Reinke et al., 2013; Stormont, 2007), researchers agree that not enough is known about the day-to-day work of people directly assisting schools and teachers in building capabilities for PBIS. Furthermore, researchers argue that more needs to be known about the day-to-day work of coaches and consultants regarding: (a) specific coaching and consulting models; (b) types and degree of contact between coaches/consultants and schools; and (c) repertoires of practice employed (Carter & Norman, 2010; Lohrmann et al., 2008; Lohrmann et al., 2013).

Third, a subset of studies (seven) point to the idea that creating specific capabilities for practice may be dependent on strategically integrating both formal and social supports. These studies largely investigate interventions that combine highly formalized routines and guidance (formal supports) with coaching and consultation (social supports). Yet these studies focus on only a few, very specific capabilities, including: (a) a narrow set of classroom-based PBIS strategies in preschool, Head Start and elementary classrooms (Benedict, 2007; Kretlow & Bartholomew, 2010; Meyers et al., 2011; Stormont et al., 2007); (b) team-based functioning/problem-solving (Newton et al., 2012; Newton et al., 2012; Todd, 2011); (c) playground supervision (Frazen & Kamps, 2008); and (d) anti-bullying in common areas (Nese et al., 2014).

Fourth, the literature does not speak to other capabilities that scholars found to be critical to implementation of PBIS, such as strong administrative leadership for Tier 1 or classroom-based PBIS strategies outside of a few investigated in pre-K and elementary classrooms (e.g., praise and precorrection statements) (Fallon et al., 2014; Kincaid et al., 2007; Myers et al., 2011; Lohrmann et al., 2008; Lohrmann, 2013).

Lastly, while this literature on developing Tier 1 capabilities focuses on the use of externally developed programs in addition to the implementation of state-level approaches (Bradshaw et al., 2008; Fallon et al., 2014; Kincaid et al., 2007; Lohrmann et al., 2008; Lohrmann et al., 2013), most of these programs appear to be interventions created (and

investigated) by university-based researchers (Carter et al., 2012; Franzen et al., 2008; Marchant et al., 2010; Newton et al., 2012a; Newton et al., 2012b; Stormont et al., 2007; Todd et al., 2011). Published evaluations of commercially developed programs are few (Feuerborn et al., 2012; Nese et al., 2014; Reinke et al., 2013), and include programs such as The Incredible Years (early elementary classroom management and organization program), Foundations (a package for guiding schools in self-creating schoolwide PBIS for all tiers) and Expect Respect (a schoolwide anti-bullying program).

What we know about classroom management programs and their designs for teachers' practice. The types of schools that are key candidates for PBIS implementation are also schools that have likely struggled to implement schoolwide improvement of any sort and are, therefore, targets for School Improvement Grants (SIG) or other source of supplemental funding to provide financial incentives for contracting with external providers to support development of capabilities for practice. A number of factors surrounding Tier 1 classroom management, such as teachers reporting that classroom management continues to be the most difficult aspect of their work and the area in which they receive the least training (Reinke et al., 2014), federal and state grant monies targeting evidence-based practice (including the scale-up of PBIS), school safety and climate as well as commercially developed classroom management programs, present a fruitful context within which to explore the development of schoolwide capabilities for behavioral management.²³ This is especially the case with respect to middle schools as both classroom management programs and research regarding creating behavioral management capabilities within middle schools are sparse.

Four themes emerged from a reading of the literature on classroom management programs: One, though programs also utilize formal supports for practice, they rely heavily on social supports, especially coaching (as well as consultation). Two, while research does speak to the ways in which programs attempt to develop the behavioral management capabilities of teachers, it does not speak to what it means to develop capabilities across interconnected roles (e.g., teachers-coaches-administrators-central office personnel). Third, the majority of published

²³ It is important to note that a number of prepackaged programs exist—and are encouraged by state implementation networks—for use at Tiers 2 and 3. Additionally, commercially developed classroom management programs predate PBIS scale-up. Finally, it appears that state PBIS implementation networks may encourage the selection of a commercial program for Tier 1 as well at least most challenged schools and districts. In fact, Michigan's PBIS network, the Michigan Integrated Behavior and Learning Support Initiative (MiBLSi), promotes the adoption of CHAMPS classwide-behavioral support program (MiBLSi representative, personal correspondence).

research has focused on the designs and outcomes of a few programs. Most of the programs were designed for early elementary rather than middle and high schools where behavioral issues are likely to be more pronounced and resources for dealing with them most limited. Fourth, a number of school-level and teacher-level characteristics have been found to affect fidelity of program implementation (FOI) and outcomes.

First, the research strongly points to social supports—especially (though not limited to) coaching and consultation—being key to implementation, fidelity and student outcomes (Artman-Meeker et al., 2014; Motoca et al., 2014; Poduska & Kurki, 2014; Reinke et al., 2014; Reinke 2012; Shernoff & Kratochwill, 2007; Webster-Stratton et al., 2011; Wehby et al., 2012). Several studies foreground coaching as a key “support system” in enhancing program fidelity, changes in teacher behavior and student outcomes (Reinke et al., 2014, p. 150). Studies such as the one conducted by Reinke (2014) found positive correlations between the amount of coaching received, amount of performance feedback, and teachers’ implementation of a universal classroom-based intervention over time.

It appears that the impact of coaching on these outcomes may hold across various coaching/consultation models. For instance, Shernoff and Kratochwill (2007) found that self-administered videotape modeling paired with consultation (VMC) led to greater levels of teachers’ use of classroom management strategies and reductions in students’ misbehavior than videotape modeling without consultation (VM). Similarly, Artman-Meeker et al.’s (2004) investigation of a classroom management approach called the *Pyramid* model found that workshop training paired with distance coaching (also known as “e-coaching”) was associated with higher implementation outcomes than workshop training alone.

Second, the literature on classroom-level behavioral management programs focuses on teachers’ practice and omits consideration of creating capabilities for other relevant roles (e.g., principals, district-level leaders, leadership teams). The studies cited above, for instance, focus almost entirely on methods for, and outcomes associated with, developing teachers’ capabilities to implement programs with fidelity. Despite research pointing to coaching (and consulting) as the key support in developing teachers’ capabilities, the literature has yet to focus on what it means to define and develop capabilities for coaching (and consulting) practice within these same programs.

One exception is Poduska and Kurki's (2014) description of the conceptual framework used by the Good Behavior Game (GBG) to guide the elementary level program's training and support model for teachers and coaches (and trainers). Although the empirical research on GBG is extensive, establishing it as thoroughly tested and investigated evidence-based intervention (Nolan et al. 2014), the authors explain that "moving programs into practice requires an understanding that the *programmatic intervention* for example, GBG, and the *support system*, that is, the training and support for the intervention, are independent, though interrelated, components of a whole" (original emphasis, Poduska & Kurki, 2014, p. 83). That is, there is still a need to understand formal and social supports both independently and interdependently of even most well-regarded classroom-level behavioral management programs.

Third, the literature focuses largely on highly-researched (and successful) commercial programs designed and implemented in pre-kindergarten and early elementary rather than programs for middle (and high) schools where incidence of misbehavior are likely to be higher and the development of capabilities for preventing and responding to them most needed. None of the studies included were designed for and implemented in middle or high schools. Moreover, the majority of the fifteen sources focus on various components of two programs: The Incredible Years (IY) (Reinke 2012; Reinke et al., 2014; Shernoff & Kratochwill, 2007; Webster-Stratton, 2011) and, as previously mentioned, the GBG (Nolan et al., 2014; Poduska & Kurki, 2014; Wehby, 2012). These interventions include classroom-wide programs for pre-K-3rd and K-5th grades, respectively. The other studies focus on other elementary-level programs (Rimm-Kaufman & Sawyer, 2004; Freiberg et al., 2009) and a sixth grade transition-to-middle-school intervention (Motoca et al., 2014).

Fourth, because teachers are the primary implementers of school programs, interventions, and practices, teacher-level characteristics have been found to influence fidelity of implementation (FOI), and, by extension, outcomes. Teacher-level characteristics found in the SEL literature to influence FOI include: age, experience, efficacy (e.g., emotional exhaustion or burnout), comfort with intervention and practices, workplace perceptions, fit of intervention with one's own philosophy and current practice, and relationship with coach (Brackett et al., 2012; Domotrovich et al., 2015; Han & Weiss 2005; Scaccia et al., 2015; Wandermann et al., 2008). Domotrovich et al. (2005) operationalized these and other factors to investigate the variation in implementation of GBG, a widely used universal classroom based SEL program designed to

improve behavior. They found that fit with teaching style, emotional exhaustion or burnout, and teacher age influenced the FOI of the program. Furthermore, a number of school-level characteristics—such as administrative leadership, modeling and use of SEL practices, allocating resources, and endorsing use of practices—were found to influence the FOI of programs and interventions (Wandermann et al., 2008; Weiss, 2005).

My critical analysis of the literature, and the specific takeaways highlighted immediately above, led to the development of four research questions described in the next chapter. These research questions were driven by a desire to contribute to our understanding of the dynamics between formal and social supports of practice in relationship to developing capabilities for practice as well as identifying and elaborating factors that enable and constrain this important work.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Research Questions

The analysis provided in the preceding chapter suggested four questions for empirical investigation with respect to the implementation of Developmental Designs (DD):

1. What is the design for the day-to-day classroom management practice of teachers?
What are the capabilities for practice required by this design for practice?
2. What formal supports for practice (e.g., first-principles, scripts, routines, supplementary guidance, codified materials) and social supports for practice (e.g., training, internal coaching/consultation, PD, performance feedback, etc.) are provided to develop those specific capabilities?
3. What are teachers' perceptions regarding: (a) more/less valuable supports of practice; (b) the ways in which these supports shape/fail to shape teacher practice; and (c) factors that enable/constrain the development of capabilities for DD practice?
4. What are DD leaders' perceptions regarding the types of challenges constraining the development of ongoing capabilities for DD practice in DD-trained schools?

Study Background: Leveraging Existing Research (and U-M Partnerships)

This study involved a comparative cross-case analysis of Developmental Designs (DD), a commercially developed program for middle school classroom organization, instructional approach and classroom management. This study leveraged existing partnerships between the University of Michigan, Origins (the provider of DD) and two middle schools. It also built upon two ongoing Combined Program of Education and Psychology (CPEP) studies at the University of Michigan. Leveraging existing data from these, this study allowed me to situate my findings in larger institutional contexts as well as to leverage existing partnerships and access.

The study from which this study draws was a 4-year quasi-experimental investigation of DD implementation in four middle schools. Three middle schools were located in a single school district in St. Paul/Minneapolis, Minnesota and one middle school was located in Ann Arbor, Michigan. The researchers described the study as an “efficient, cost-effective investigation that

also allows Origins to make informed (data-driven) decisions” (Jagers & Ross, 2013).²⁴ The three foci of the study included investigating the core components of the DD approach, implementation quality and the impact of the DD approach on student outcomes.

The two middle schools included as cases in this study were given the pseudonyms “James Garfield Middle School (JGMS)” and “Sibley Middle School (SMS)” to protect the anonymity of study participants. Sources of evidence included in this study were: (a) program documentation; (b) semi-structured interviews; (c) participant-observation; and (d) teacher surveys.

Case Study Design

A case study design was an appropriate research methodology to investigate my research questions for several reasons described below:

1. Consistent with the aim of this study, case study design, allowing for exploratory investigation, is appropriate when the researcher is “interested in insight, discovery and interpretation rather than hypotheses testing” (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 43);
2. Case study methodology is appropriate when organizations (e.g., commercially developed programs) and groups (e.g., teachers and internal coaches) are the focus of inquiry (Merriam & Rossman, 2006; Yin, 2003); and
3. A case study allows for both “in-depth description and analysis of a bounded system” (Merriam, 2009, p. 43). In this study, the “bounded system” is DD’s design for practice, coordination of formal and social supports and teachers’ perceptions and use of these with respect to classroom-based PBIS (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

In addition to meeting the foundational criteria supporting the selection of case study methodology described above, the selection of this methodology was also based on the need to capture nuanced factors and characteristics shaping the realities and actions of school actors, and by extension, their individual and collective “relationship” with the DD approach. There is consensus among scholars that cognitive understandings, implementation and outcomes surrounding educational policy and evidence-based practices/programs (EBPs) are highly sensitive to variation in school context (Harn et. al., 2013; Elias et al., 2003). As aptly explained

²⁴ “Origins” refers to The Origins Program, a non-profit 501(c)3 organization founded in 1979. Origins is the sole provider of Developmental Designs and, up until recently, Responsive Classroom (RC). It offers workshops, consulting, DVDs, books and other resources for teachers, schools and districts.

by Yin (2009): “Case studies help us to understand processes of events, projects and programs and to discover context characteristics that will shed light on an issue or object” (p. 44).

The Case: *Developmental Designs*

The focus of this cross-case case study was Developmental Designs (DD). Implemented in 42 states and seven countries, DD is considered by Origins as primarily a Tier 1/Universal Intervention for grades five through nine that integrates academics and behavior management with social emotional learning.

Although DD was not designed explicitly with the intent of supporting Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS), the program can be utilized for purposes of improving PBIS implementation and fidelity. According to DD’s online documentation (“Development Designs and PBIS Fact Sheet” 2015), the differences between DD and PBIS are as follows:

Positive Behavioral Intervention Supports (PBIS) is an evidence-based framework for improving and sustaining effective schoolwide behavior and instructional systems. PBIS is not a curriculum, intervention, or practice, but is designed as a decision-making framework that guides the selection, integration, and implementation of evidence-based practices for improving academic and behavioral outcomes for all students....

Developmental Designs’ comprehensive practices integrate social and academic learning. The *Developmental Designs* methods are developmentally grounded for grades 5-9 and offer practical strategies for improving student achievement and behavior. Schools can use the *Developmental Designs* approach to implement quality PBIS (“PBIS and the *Developmental Designs* Approach”, 2015).²⁵

Sampling

Convenience sampling was employed to select both school sites and participants. According to Etikan et al. (2015), convenience sampling is a type of nonprobability or nonrandom sampling “where members of the target population that meet certain practical criteria, such as easy accessibility, geographical proximity, availability at a given time, or the willingness to participate” are included for the purpose of the study (p. 2). In order to help

²⁵ The second half of this document is subtitled “A Look in Detail” and includes a chart linking PBIS Key Features to specific Developmental Designs Practices.

mitigate the limitations of this sampling method, both sites also met important selection criteria (Farroki & Hamidabad, 2012).

Site selection. The two school sites selected met the following criteria:

1. In 2nd year of DD implementation or beyond;
2. Considered typical or modal in level of DD implementation;
3. Currently assigned or employing an internal coach (or someone acting in this capacity),²⁶
4. Having significant population of students traditionally thought of as “at-risk” for school failure (e.g., free and reduced lunch, English language learners).

These criteria were important for two key reasons. First, selecting schools that met these criteria increased the likelihood that schools (and their staff) had been exposed to all of DD’s formal and social supports for practice and could speak to their usefulness in supporting their practice. Second, identifying and selecting from at-risk schools contributed to understandings about what it means to create capabilities for practice in challenged school settings. It is in these types of schools where the development of capabilities for practice is most needed and where such development, specifically regarding behavioral management capabilities, has also proven difficult.

Participant selection. Three criteria were used to identify teachers for study participation:

1. Having completed DD1 training (at minimum);
2. Varying in core subject area taught (i.e. math, ELA, science and social studies);
3. Varying in grade-level assignment.

These characteristics were important for three key reasons. First, and as alluded to above, selecting teachers by these criteria (e.g., having completed DD1 training) increased the likelihood that they had been exposed to all the program’s formal and social supports for practice (with respect to classroom management) and could speak to their usefulness in supporting classroom management. Second, selecting teachers from different core subject areas (math, ELA, science, social studies) and grade levels increased the likelihood of variation in data across school sites and participants.

²⁶ Selecting schools that (also) have an internal coach was also important because coaching represents the chief social support for teachers.

SMS's principal and assistant principal and an Origins staff member (responsible for collecting study data at the three St. Paul/Minneapolis middle schools) identified all teachers at both schools who met the criteria described above. All teachers meeting the criteria were recruited to participate in this study through email. This email described the study's focus, audience (dissertation committee) time commitments (number and length of interviews), participation incentives and the methods used to provide anonymity. Teachers were given a \$25.00 gift card following each interview.

Overview of Selected Sites and Participants

The two school sites—James Garfield Middle School (JGMS) and Sibley Middle School (SMS)—were comparable in terms of student demographics, stability of school leadership and years of DD implementation. There were 20 participants in all. Participants included teachers, internal coaches (JGMS only), school leaders and DD leaders.

James Garfield Middle School (JGMS). JGMS was one of the three Minnesota schools participating in the Jagers and Kwame-Ross (2013) study. These researchers and DD staff identified JGMS as the school with the highest level of implementation of all three Minnesota middle schools. JGMS had approximately 784 students, over 61% of which received free or reduced lunch. It also had substantial minority and English Language Learner (ELL) populations. JGMS had undergone drastic shifts in student population in the last decade as evidenced by the increases in students of color, ELL students and students receiving free or reduced lunch. Both school staffing and leadership appeared to be stable at JGMS. Several JGMS teachers recruited for participation were teaching veterans who had had spent their entire careers at JGMS. The school's current principal was entering her fifth year and had introduced a number of initiatives in an effort to meet the needs of students as well as external, school improvement pressures. DD was one such school initiative. As of Fall 2015, JGMS was in its third year of DD implementation.

Sibley Middle School (SMS). Like JGMS, SMS was also considered a high implementing DD school with very supportive building administration.²⁷ SMS had approximately 484 students, with more than 51% receiving free or reduced lunch. It also had substantial minority and ELL student populations. While school leadership appeared to be stable,

²⁷ This was according to DD leadership and the principal investigators of the ongoing studies within which this case study was conducted.

as evidenced by its principal entering his sixth year, SMS underwent drastic changes in staffing. Due to its recent adoption of the International Baccalaureate (IB) program, more than half of SMS's content area staff (12 total) were replaced, effective Fall 2015. A DD1 training was held for new teacher hires in August of 2015. Fall of 2015 marked the beginning of SMS's fourth year of DD implementation.

Commonalities between JGMS and SMS. James Garfield Middle School (JGMS) and Sibley Middle School (SMS) made good comparison cases for several reasons. One, other than the criteria discussed above, these schools also shared common characteristics with respect to student demographics (e.g., high percentages of at-risk populations of students). Two, both schools adopted DD around the same time (JGMS in the summer of 2013 and SMS in the summer of 2012). Three, both JGMS and SMS were identified as schools worthy of comparison by both the principal investigators of the study and the DD leadership.

Participants

Study participants included the following: fourteen teachers, two internal coaches (JGMS only), two school leaders (JGMS's principal and SMS's assistant principal) and three DD leaders.

Teachers. Of those meeting study criteria, a total of 14 teachers agreed to participate. All middle school grade-levels (6th-8th grades) and core content areas were represented among teacher participants. Additionally, years of teaching experience ranged from less than three years to thirty years of teaching.

Coaches. I identified two individuals (one from each site) who were principally responsible for providing in-classroom support to teachers. Both individuals had received at least the same level of DD training (DD1 or DD1/DD2) as the teachers in their respective schools. SMS did not have a designated internal coach. Instead, according to the principal, the assistant principal served in this capacity and had been instrumental in DD implementation. The assistant principal had attended both DD1 and DD2 trainings.

School-level leaders. I selected two formal school-level leaders, one from each school site. By formal school-level leader, I mean the most senior positional leader responsible for supervising, monitoring and/or evaluating the use of DD practices and implementation by teachers (and possibly the work of internal coaches as well). At JGMS, this role was enacted by the principal; at SMS, by the assistant principal.

Program leaders. Three DD leaders were selected to participate. DD leaders often had multiple roles and responsibilities including providing coaching supports, workshop facilitation and consultation services as well as designing and revising DD supports. All three DD leaders had been in their roles for more than ten years.

Sources of Evidence

I drew from four sources of evidence to answer my research questions: documentation; semi-structured interviews; participant-observation; and teacher surveys (taken from the larger study described above). Teacher survey data helped me crosscheck teacher reports in interviews and, where possible, situate the study's findings in larger schooling, organizational, and teaching contexts.

Documents

A range of program documents and other written material were collected for the purposes of understanding the DD design for classroom management and its approach to developing capabilities for practice. Documentation is both a complementary method, particularly as relating to interviewing and participant-observation, and a stand-alone research method (Bowen, 2009). Accordingly, documents provide important background, historical and contextual information and can both supplement and shape other qualitative methods employed (e.g., shaping interview questions and suggesting events to more keenly focus on during participant-observation).

Documents collected and analyzed included: online content (e.g., DD website), manuals, and workshop and other professional development materials.

Document analysis was employed to answer my first two questions regarding designs for the day-to-day practice of teachers with respect to classroom-based PBIS, the specific capabilities foregrounded in these designs as well as the provision and design of formal supports for practice. Designs for practice are often codified in material resources (i.e. formal supports). Moreover, some aspects of social supports for practice are also codified in material resources as well.

Interviews

Two 45-60 minute interviews were conducted with each teacher and DD leader and one 60-minute interview was conducted with each school leader and internal coach.²⁸ Interviews are

²⁸ One JGMS teacher was unable to be reached to schedule a second interview.

the most common method of data collection in qualitative research and can be used to explore a wide range of complex participant characteristics including experiences, views, motivations and beliefs (Gil et al., 2003). Interviews were semi-structured to ensure comparable data are collected across school sites and participants while allowing for the pursuit of understanding regarding specific issues particular to school sites, roles, and emergent themes.

I conducted both face-to-face and phone interviews.²⁹ Four reasons led to the decision to include phone interviewing. One, as Carr and Worth (2001) explain, “Studies which directly compare telephone and face-to-face interviewing tend to conclude that telephone interviewing produces data which are at least comparable in quality to those attained by the face-to-face method” (p. 511). Two, conducting phone interviews places less strain on both the organization being studied and study participants thereby making recruitment easier and participation more likely. Three, phone interviews have become increasingly attractive to qualitative researchers (Novick, 2008). In addition to making study participation more likely (and flexible), it also reduces demands on time and expense. For instance, conducting two face-to-face interviews with JGMS participants would have been cost prohibitive due to the costs of traveling, transportation, and lodging.

Interviewing participants allowed me to answer my third and fourth research questions regarding teacher and leader perceptions of formal and social supports for practice and the enablers and obstacles of developing DD capabilities.

Participant-Observation

According to Becker and Greer (1957), participant-observation is “a yardstick against which to measure the completeness of data gathered in other ways”, by enabling researchers access to information which “escape[s] us when we use other methods” (p. 28). Researchers have written about the affordances of combining participant-observation with other qualitative data collection methods, particular interviewing (Atkinson & Coffey, 2003).

Participant-observation of the weeklong DD1/DD2 training at SMS was used to understand DD’s day-to-day design for classroom management practice as well as the way in which it leveraged formal and social resources to develop such capabilities during formal training. My role during the 4-day training was that of a participant-observer. That is, I attended

²⁹ JGMS teachers did one face-to-face interview (first interview) and one phone interview (second interview) as did DD leaders. All interviews with SMS participants (teachers, school leaders) were face-to-face.

each session and participated in all aspects of the training as if I were an incoming SMS teacher preparing to implement DD in my own classroom in the fall. I also made observations of the workshop facilitator and other training participants.

Participating in and observing DD's weeklong DD1/DD2 training was important as these official trainings were among the most critical, if not primary, means of transmitting the DD approach to teachers (and other staff). Data collected from attending the training helped me answer my first and second research questions regarding DD's design for practice and the types of formal and social resources DD uses to develop capabilities for DD practice.

My strategy for writing field notes involved: (a) taking notes during the training and (b) memoing following each training session. Note taking focused on: content from the DD instructor's PowerPoint slides as well as recording training activities and the strategies employed by the DD instructor (e.g., group activities, discussion, modeling). I also collected and analyzed materials given to workshop participants. Following each day's session, I wrote an analytical memo based related to my first and second research questions.

Teacher Surveys

As previously stated, this study includes teacher survey data administered to JGMS and SMS teachers as part of the Jagers & Ross (2013) study. Teacher survey items measured constructs such as teacher efficacy (individual and collective), teaching beliefs, and teaching practices related classroom management (see Appendix B). The following scales were included in teacher surveys: Teaching Adolescents, Teaching Beliefs, Culturally Responsive Teaching, Authoritative Teaching, Teaching Practices, Teacher Collaboration, Collective Efficacy Beliefs, Impact of Teaching Efforts, Level of Satisfaction With Teaching and Stress Factors.

A total of 54 teacher surveys—30 SMS teacher surveys and 24 JGMS teacher surveys—were included. Descriptive statistical analyses and t-tests were used to compare differences in scaled scores between JGMS and SMS.³⁰

Although the surveys administered at SMS and JGMS were very similar, there were differences.³¹ For instance, JGMS's survey did not have items relating to "Sources of Stress" and

³⁰ Only three of 54 teacher surveys contained missing data (one JGMS teacher survey and two SMS teacher survey).

³¹ Though there are common items, neither the surveys nor the number of times they were administered at JGMS and SMS are identical. Teacher surveys at SMS were administered in three waves and, apart from a few very minor word changes, were identical. Teacher surveys at JGMS were administered in two waves (6 months apart). The teacher survey administered in the first wave at JGMS appears to be identical to the survey administered at SMS.

“Impact of Teaching Efforts.” Furthermore, whereas survey data could be linked to specific teachers at JGMS, SMS’s survey data was anonymous.

Table 3.1: Sources of Evidence by Research Question

	Documents	Interviews	Participant- Observation	Teacher Surveys
RQ1: What is the design for the day-to-day classroom management practice of teachers? What are the capabilities for practice required by this design for practice?	X	X	X	
RQ2: What formal supports for practice (e.g., first-principles, scripts, routines, supplementary guidance, codified materials) and social supports for practice (e.g., training, internal coaching, consultation, PD, performance feedback, etc.) are provided to develop those specific capabilities?	X	X	X	
RQ3: What are teachers’ perceptions regarding: (a) more/less valuable supports of practice; (b) the ways in which these supports shape/fail to shape teacher practice; and (c) factors that enable or constrain the development of capabilities for DD practice?		X		X
RQ4: What are DD leaders’ perceptions regarding the types of challenges constraining the development of ongoing capabilities for DD practice in DD-trained schools?		X		

I used the results from teacher surveys to answer my third research question; specifically, to crosscheck teacher reports in interviews regarding the ways in which DD shaped their practice and to situate these findings in a broader context.

However, several changes were made to the second survey including abbreviating the number of items under a few sections, adding sections, etc.

Research question #1. The first question centered on elucidating DD's design for the day-to-day practice of classroom management. To truly understand DD's design, it was important to immerse myself in DD training, as well as the available program documentation that they provide their teachers and schools. Sources of evidence I used to answer this question included documents and participant-observation. The documents I collected included: information from DD's website, DD1 manuals and DD1 training materials. I also collected data as a participant-observer of SMS's DD1 training as the weeklong training is the primary method of transmitting knowledge of the DD approach. Lastly, I also conducted semi-structured interviews with selected participants (e.g., DD leaders/consultants) asking them to describe their understanding of DD, its approach to classroom management, and the capabilities it develops and requires.

Research question #2. The second question, "What formal supports for practice (e.g., first-principles, scripts, routines, supplementary guidance, codified materials) and social supports for practice (e.g., training, internal coaching/consultation, PD, performance feedback, etc.) are provided to develop those specific capabilities?" is aimed at elucidating the types of supports of practice provided to support DD's design for practice and their key features. The sources of evidence used to answer this question included documents, interviews, and participant-observation.

Research question #3. The third research question, "What are teachers' perceptions regarding: (a) more/less valuable supports of practice; (b) the ways in which these supports shape/fail to shape teacher practice; and (c) factors that enable/constrain the development of capabilities for DD practice?" was aimed at elucidating teachers' perceptions regarding the usefulness of DD's formal and social supports in developing their capabilities for DD practice, the ways in which they changed or failed to change practice, and factors that enabled and constrained the development of DD capabilities. Because this question was focused on teachers' perceptions, understandings, and opinions of DD's supports, I used teacher interviews my sole source of evidence. As interviews are the only source of evidence I drew from to answer this question, I established validity through conducting two waves of interviews using the second interview to engage in member-check my tentative themes and emerging findings. Member-checking with participants did not reveal discrepancies between my broad interpretations and participants' understandings. I also triangulated teacher reports with teacher survey data.

Research question #4. The fourth and final research question asked leaders to reflect on their decades-long DD implementation work to describe challenges inherent in developing capabilities for DD practice. Two semi-structured interviews with DD leaders were used to answer this question.

Analysis

Data analysis proceeded in two overlapping phases or stages: one, ongoing, iterative analysis including data collection, researcher reflection and memo writing; and, two, the use of Microsoft Office software to (re)code, (re)organize and more systematically analyze the data.

Analyses were both deductive and inductive. Initial codes were identified in relation to the analytical framework and each research question (grounded coding) while other codes emerged from analysis of the data itself (open coding).

Analytic Tools

Consistent with the nature of exploratory research, data analyses involved a combination of *deductive* (theory driven) and *inductive* (data-driven) approaches. I conducted both within- and across-case analyses. Consistent with the demands of qualitative research, analysis was iterative. This included analytic memo writing throughout the data collection period and analysis stages.

I used a hybrid approach to code interview and document data (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Deductively, I leveraged my conceptual framework to identify sensitizing concepts for closed coding. I also inductively identified emergent codes (using open coding) that go beyond initial conceptual framing to enable new and unanticipated understandings.

Analytic Tools. The analytic tools I used to complete open and grounded coding, category construction, and theming included memoing, inductive and deductive analysis, constant comparison, within- and cross-case analyses, and Microsoft Word.

Memoing. I wrote analytic memos immediately following each interview, each phase of document collection (e.g., the end of the participant-observation phase) and for each set of participants (i.e. teachers, internal coaches, school-level leaders and program leaders and consultants). At the close of the data collection period, I reviewed all interview transcripts, documents and analytical memos and wrote a formal analytic memo before conducting more formal analyses (i.e. second phase of analysis). During analysis, I wrote memos to define, clarify and describe emerging categories, themes and findings.

Inductive and deductive analyses. Both grounded coding and open-coding schemes were employed. In terms of grounded coding, initial or provisional codes originated from both my analytic framework and research questions. An open-coding scheme developed commensurate with analysis; that is, codes originated organically from the data. Themes were identified in relationship to coding patterns and relationships between codes.

Constant comparative method. I used the constant comparative method to develop codes, categories and themes. By constant comparative method, I mean the analytic technique of breaking qualitative data into units and comparing units in order to identify, define, refine and saturate codes, categories and themes. As Taylor and Bogdan (1984) summarize: “in the constant comparative method the researcher simultaneously codes and analyzes data in order to develop concepts; by continually comparing specific incidents in the data, the researcher refines these concepts, identifies their properties, explores their relationships to one another, and integrates them into a coherent explanatory model” (p126).

Within- and cross-case analyses. In multiple-case studies, there are two stages of analysis—the within-case analysis and the cross-case analysis. Specifically, I analyzed data pertaining to each school as a “bounded case” and then analyzed data across both schools looking for patterns, themes and disconfirming evidence.

Microsoft Word. In part due to the small scale of the study, Microsoft Word was selected over more specialized analysis software (e.g., NVivo, ATLAS.ti, MAXQDA). As explained by Merriam (2001) below, the use of Microsoft Office software in lieu of applications specifically designed to support qualitative research, is common:

Word processors such as Word Perfect and Microsoft Word are probably the most familiar of the “office software” programs. This very familiarity makes them the first choice of many qualitative researchers. In fact, the strengths of a standard word processors or are often unmatched in the more specialized software (p. 169).

I found that Microsoft Word allowed for more nimble and intuitive analysis, coding and organization. Among the functions I used were Word Review and Find to systematically search through, code and organize data.

Internal and External Validity and Reliability

To validate my claims internally, I (a) conducted two waves of interviews, the second of which was used to member-check my tentative understandings and finding; (b) triangulated data

across multiple sources (DD program documentation, interviews, participant-observation field notes and teacher surveys); and (c) triangulated across multiple categories of participants (DD leaders, building level leaders, coaches and teachers).

As this is a comparative case study involving two middle school sites, I attempt to generalize my findings to the broader literature informing my critical analysis and analytical framework. I also situate my overall findings in a conversation regarding how they reinforce or challenge what is known about the use of formal and social supports (and their interactions) in creating capabilities for practice.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS: DD's DESIGN FOR CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT PRACTICE

Introduction

My analytic framework takes as its point of departure that teachers' capabilities for classroom practice are developed through exposure to, and interdependent use of, both formal and social supports of practice. Developmental Designs (DD) serves as a case for exploring the formal and social supports of practice (and their interdependencies) provided to develop DD capabilities. As such, it is first necessary to understand the specific aims of the DD approach: that is, what is actually expected of a DD-trained teacher.

As a result, my first research question—*What is the design for the day-to-day classroom management practice of teachers? What are the capabilities for practice required by this design for practice?*—aims to describe the most salient design features of the DD approach and provide an analysis of the specific capabilities for practice embedded within this design. I first attempted to mine sources of evidence—interviews with DD leaders, the Developmental Designs 1 Resource Book (2012), and field notes from participation in the DD1 weeklong training—that would allow me to understand and describe DD as an approach. After unpacking the DD design, I then attempted to give an analytical accounting of what it was teachers were expected to *know and be able to do* with respect to managing (mis)behavior in their classrooms.

Each of the three types of evidentiary sources provided a unique lens on understanding the DD design and its implicit and explicit capabilities for management practice. First, all three DD leaders had worked for Origins (the sole provider of DD) for more than a decade. As former teachers, they received in-classroom coaching from Linda Crawford (founder of Origins and creator of the *Responsive Classroom* approach, a program DD draws heavily from). Additionally, all three leaders worked extensively with schools and teachers as DD consultants, workshop facilitators, and coaches. Second, the Developmental Designs 1 Resource Book (2012) (i.e., the DD1 workshop training manual) offered a more direct, book-length account of the DD approach. Third, my participation in the DD1 training gave me direct insight into how DD is taught to and experienced by teachers.

My answer to this two-part research question is as follows: First, my analysis supports that DD's design for classroom management practice is both philosophical *and* practical. That is, while DD's design for practice is built upon a bedrock of philosophy, theory, and research (concerning adolescent students, education, and classroom management), at the center of its design are a set of discrete teacher practices (i.e. DD's "ten core practices and structures"). Understanding and implementation of the DD approach as designed requires an understanding of (and alignment with) both DD's underpinnings and discrete teacher practices.

Second, my analysis also supports that DD's design for classroom management differs drastically from modal management practices of typical U.S. schools and teachers, requiring the development of specific capabilities of practice. Classroom management in the U.S. is predominately viewed through the perspectives of action (e.g., conceived as a verb), teacher control, and systematic responses to misbehavior (e.g., issuing of rewards and punishments). DD, on the other hand, differs sharply in that it emphasizes discipline as a domain of knowledge, the development of students' self-control and self-discipline (and other prosocial, SEL skills/attitudes), and personalized (or student-centered) responses to misbehavior. Capabilities required by the DD design for classroom management are distilled into three main constituents. These three constituents include: a) dispositional traits; b) foundational knowledge; and c) procedural skill/practical knowledge.

Below, I break my findings into three major sections. The first section describes the foundational underpinnings of the DD design (e.g., history, goals, operating principles, knowledge base, and approach to classroom management). The second section describes DD's ten core practices and structures. The third section describes the capabilities of practice required to enact the DD design for classroom management.

Foundational Underpinnings of the DD Design

DD's design was fairly well specified in its program documentation, training materials and in interviews with DD leaders. As well, much of DD's design is based on the *Responsive Classroom* approach.

The overarching goal is to increase educational (and societal) equity by way of developing students' responsible independence. DD leaders view DD's approach to classroom management and, specifically, the perspective that the purpose of classroom management is to develop students' *self-discipline* and *self-control* as critical to realizing this goal.

The backbone of DD's design includes its operating premises, guiding principles, and the knowledge base from which these emerged. These underpinnings inform all aspects of DD's approach, including its approach to classroom management. DD's operating premises correspond to the areas of intervention DD targets: social-emotional learning, relationships and community building, and (motivating) instruction. These operating premises also correspond to the most prominent aspects of DD's knowledge base: SEL, knowing (and meeting) students' core development needs, and relationship- and community-based approaches to teaching and learning.

Finally, DDs underpinnings inform prominent aspects of DD's approach to classroom management. These aspects include: (a) a needs-based perspective on (mis)behavior; (b) using classroom management to teach and reinforce students' self-control/self-discipline (and other prosocial, SEL skills and attitudes); and (c) having a relationship-based perspective on managing students' (mis)behavior.

Shared History with the *Responsive Classroom* Approach

It is all but impossible to have a deep grasp of DD—its origination, design, and the capabilities for practice it requires—without understanding its history with, and relationship to, *Responsive Classroom* (RC). Prior to its launch of “Responsive Classroom for Middle Schools” in 2016, RC was an award-winning SEL approach to organizing instruction and classroom management in elementary schools. According to DD leaders, *Developmental Designs* was largely an adaptation of the RC approach for use in middle schools.

The sole provider of DD, and until recently RC as well, is The Origins Program (commonly referred to as Origins), a non-profit 501(c)3 organization formed in 1979. Until RC's recent separation from Origins, RC and DD shared common publication authorship, workshop designers, consultants, coaches, facilitators, and other personnel. RC and DD share a number of design features in common. These include their foundational underpinnings (e.g., operating premises and guiding principles), many of their core practices, and common design features of implementation supports.

While empirical research on DD is sparse, RC has been recognized as one of the most well-designed and researched SEL programs for preschool and elementary grade levels, and is widely used in elementary schools around the country (Weissburg et al., 2013).

Despite its success in elementary schools, DD leaders reported that Origin's decision to test RC in middle schools was met with frustration. One DD leader described how, in lieu of

abandoning middle schools altogether, Origins allowed RC to be adapted for use in middle schools through the creation of a similar, but separate, approach:

Basically our work grew out of that work. They started going into middle school, many, many years ago and got frustrated and we're going to give up on it. That's when we said, "we'll take that work." I helped to design this work and I designed it because I used Responsive Classroom in my middle school. We've adapted it over the years, of course, but the basis is Responsive Classroom work.

Another DD leader, who worked first as a Responsive Classroom teacher and workshop facilitator, described the transition from the use of Responsive Classroom in middle schools to the development and naming of the Developmental Designs approach:

I worked for Origins for fifteen years. I was a Responsive Classroom facilitator for many, many summers before I came on board full time. During that time, they wrote "Responsive Classroom for the Middle School" and then it ended up being "Developmental Design for the Middle School," then, finally, it ended up being *Developmental Designs*.

Overarching Motivation and Goal

The overarching motivation and goal of DD—as explicitly stated in its provider's mission statement and further elaborated by DD leaders—is to increase equity and positively impact schools' and society's most challenging problems. DD's overarching goal—to teach students 'responsible independence'—is critical to realizing this mission.

Importantly, teaching students *self*-discipline and/or *self*-control, key aspects of DD's approach to classroom management, are considered requisites for exercising responsible independence and, thus, realizing greater equity.

Overarching motivation. Origins' mission is to "promote an equitable and humane multicultural society through quality education for all" (About Origins, n.d.). The development of DD (and RC) was an attempt to realize this goal in U.S. schools and around the globe.

DD leaders (one of whom co-created DD) described the motivations of DD in more concrete yet equally ambitious terms. They related the broad motivation of improving equity to that of improving a number of relevant schooling issues that they viewed as fueling educational and societal inequities. Specifically, DD leaders described the DD approach as a means to positively impact the school-to-prison pipeline, suspensions and expulsions, out-of-classroom

referrals, and loss of instructional time (particularly students of color), as well as equipping students with the social and emotional skills needed to succeed in school, career and life.

Overarching goal. All three DD leaders described DD’s overarching goal, or “end game” as “build[ing] kids to a place of responsible independence.” Although responsible independence lacked a formal definition, the concept was discussed in relationship to equity, self-discipline and student empowerment. Below, one DD leader described responsible independence in terms of developing students’ ownership:

I can create classrooms in which students are in control of so much of the work... As our year rolls on, and they start to understand the routines of the classroom, they’re the ones who should be in charge of as much of the classroom as we can make it.

Another DD leader discussed responsible independence in terms of both the specific skills it requires and its pinnacle—cultivating responsible citizenship:

We want to build kids to a place of responsible independence. We want them to learn how to be self-monitoring, self-sufficient, responsible citizens and to be able to communicate and problem-solve with each other...It really is about providing them the tools to build themselves and mold themselves into the citizen they want to be.

Because students are expected to internalize self-control and take charge of much of the classroom environment, the goal of cultivating students’ responsible independence has implications for classroom management.

Operating Premises, Guiding Principles and Areas of Intervention

DD’s design is based on operating premises, guiding principles, and components of student success that point to a coherent theory of action. In sum, this theory of action is that optimal learning environments (schools and classrooms) for adolescents are those in which: (a) there exists trusting teacher-student and student-student relationship within a supportive community; (b) SEL skills necessary for the realization of responsible independence are taught and reinforced; and (c) instruction is tailored to the needs of the adolescent learner.

Operating premises. According to Kwame-Ross, Crawford and Klug (2011), “the Developmental Designs approach is based on the understanding that the *context* for learning shapes its quality” (original emphasis, p. 145).³² According to these researchers, the following

³² I drew from this article to understand the DD design due to the fact that at least two of these authors were deeply involved in Origins and DD. As stated previously, Linda Crawford founded Origins and helped

statements characterize DD's operating premises and form the core characteristics of optimal adolescent learning environments:

1. Healthy peer and adult to student relationships make a strong, safe community;
2. Student social competencies engender the responsible independence necessary for both social and academic success; and
3. Instruction is designed to effectively engage adolescents in learning.

These guiding premises were corroborated across all three sources of evidence and are implicitly contained in other aspects of DD's design described throughout this chapter.³³

Guiding principles. In addition to its operating premises, DD's design is also "founded upon evidence-based principles that form the core of successful teaching and learning in the middle grades" (Guiding Principles Research Basis Classroom Practices, n.d.). These seven principles are "guiding principles" in that they form the basis of DD's classroom-specific practices and structures. These principles, as espoused in documentation and training content, are as follows:

1. Knowing students' physical, emotional, social, and intellectual needs is as important as knowing the content that is taught;
2. People learn best by actively constructing their own understanding and meaning;
3. The greatest cognitive growth occurs when learning is leveraged by social interaction;
4. Goals are best achieved through the incremental mastery of tasks;
5. Social learning in a supportive community is as important to success as academic learning;
6. There is a set of personal/social skills that students need to learn and practice in order to be successful socially and academically: cooperation, assertion, responsibility, empathy, and self-control; and
7. Trust among adults is a fundamental necessity for academic and social success.

write both RC and DD. Terrance Kwame-Ross served as Executive Director of Origins as was my initial contact for the study. Previously, he served as a DD-trained teacher, school principal, consultant and workshop facilitator including for one of the cases included in this study.

³³ All three leaders discussed the criticality of healthy, trusting and positive teacher-student relationships and social-emotional learning as the center of DD's approach to classroom management as well as the relationship between student engagement and achievement. These three premises were also embedded in the workshop facilitator's PowerPoint and discussed in myriad ways throughout the training. Lastly, the Developmental Designs 1 Resource Book (2012) and Developmental Designs 2 Resource Book (2012) also include content that ties directly to the importance of student-teacher relationships, social-emotional competencies and student engagement.

These principles can be viewed as a reduction of the empirical, theoretical, and philosophical knowledge bases DD draws from (described in sections below).

Areas of intervention (components of student success). Consistent with its operating premises, guiding principles, and what it calls “the three rings of an engaged learner” (i.e. supportive community, social-emotional skills, and motivating instruction), DD intervenes in “three areas of school life.” These three areas include: social-emotional learning, relationship and community building, and academic achievement (Developmental Designs 1 Resource Book, 2012).

Knowledge Base

The DD design—including its operating premises, guiding principles, and areas of intervention—emerged from the knowledge base from which it draws. According to Kwame-Ross et al. (2011), the “theoretical and conceptual framework of the Developmental Designs approach stands in the work of a variety of theorists” (p. 146). DD leaders and DD literature corroborated this assertion. Both pointed to an array of theoretical, empirical, and philosophical contributions, or “principles, research and beliefs,” that served as the foundation of DD approach. Three aspects of DD’s foundation were emphasized across all three sources: (a) social-emotional learning (SEL); (b) a relationship- and community-based approach to teaching and learning; and (c) understanding and leveraging “the science of child development” to understand and meet students’ needs.

Overview of broad knowledge base. DD’s knowledge base includes a range of psychoanalytic theorists/theories concerning drivers of human behavior and intellectual development. Key theories and theorists leveraged by the DD design include: a needs-based framework for human motivation (Maslow, 1954); choice theory (Glasser, 1998); social-discipline models of behavior (Dreikurs, Peppers, & Grunwald, 1998); cognitive and social-learning theory (Dewey, 1909/1916; Rogoff, 1990; Vygotsky, 1934/1986); psychosocial development (Bandura, 1997; Erikson, 1968); and brain-based learning (Jensen, 2005).

These theorists and others support another cornerstone of the DD approach: that adolescents (and human beings in general) have four basic, fundamental needs (autonomy, competence, fun, and relationships) that must be met for healthy development and contentment.

DD's operating premises, guiding principles, and areas of intervention (and components of school success) described above integrate these theories into a coherent theory of action regarding how to create and maintain optimal learning environments for adolescent children.

Prominent aspects of DD's knowledge base and design. The most heavily emphasized aspects of DD's design include SEL, a relationship- and community-based approach to teaching and learning, and adolescent development. These three underpinnings were emphasized in DD literature, interviews with DD leaders, and in the DD1 training.

An SEL "approach." Key in understanding DD's design for practice is understanding that it is, first and foremost, a social-emotional learning (SEL) approach. SEL is one of the three rings of the DD approach. As stated in the Developmental Designs 1 Resource Book (2012): "In the Developmental Designs approach we develop these socially significant capacities: cooperation, communication, assertion, responsibility, engagement, empathy, and self-control" (p. 3). These social-emotional skills and attitudes are also contained within DD's seven guiding principles. Importantly, leaders emphasized that rather than DD being an SEL *program*, it is instead a comprehensive *approach* to organizing every facet of classroom instruction, including teaching, learning, classroom culture and discipline.

The Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL) defines SEL as "the process through which children and adults acquire and effectively apply the knowledge, attitudes, and skills necessary to understand and manage emotions, set and achieve positive goals, feel and show empathy for others, establish and maintain positive relationships, and make responsible decisions" (Domitrovich, 2015b, p. 5). CASEL has also identified five sets of cognitive, affective, and behavioral competency clusters. These five domains relate to intrapersonal and/or interpersonal domains and include: self-awareness (intrapersonal), self-management (intrapersonal), social awareness (intrapersonal), relationship skills (intrapersonal) and responsible decision-making (inter- and intra- personal).

Also according to CASEL, approaches to developing SEL competencies include: infusing SEL in teaching practices (e.g., the Developmental Designs approach), infusing SEL instruction into an academic curriculum, creating policies and organizational structures that support students' SEL development, and directly teaching SEL skills in free-standing lessons.

DD leaders' descriptions of DD were consistent with infusing SEL in teaching practices. DD leaders' descriptions of DD were consistent with infusing SEL in teaching practices. One

DD leader described how infusing DD in teaching practices sets it apart from other SEL middle school programs and interventions:

Developmental Designs is an approach. One thing Linda schooled me on is not to use that word “program” because there are programs that try to do what we do. I did them [as a teacher]. There’s one called Lion’s Quest. It’s skills for adolescents. You pull it off the shelf and from 2:30 to 3:00 you read about responsibility. You talk about responsibility. You do a worksheet or watch a video. And that’s responsibility. What we’re trying to do is create a classroom in which you are a certain way with kids. You have certain beliefs about kids, your goals, and about the way you manage, when mistakes are made, how do you deal with it, how do you speak to kids, how to you deliver content to the kids. We’re trying to build classrooms that are a very specific way.

That DD is not, for instance, a stand-alone, prepackaged set of curricula has implications for both the type and degree of practice capabilities necessary to support effective use.

The relationship between PBIS and SEL approaches to managing behavior. SEL also differs from Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS)—a multi-tiered framework for preventing, responding to, and monitoring misbehavior widely used in the United States and backed by federal and state policy. Although SEL can be implemented to support the Tier 1, universal, school wide PBIS, there are notable differences as well as commonalities between these approaches.

SEL and PBIS are (also) two distinct (but complementary) approaches to school discipline. PBIS and SEL differ substantively in their theoretical foundations as well as in the objectives and methods employed to manage school discipline. Researchers have advocated integrating PBIS and SEL (PBIS+SEL), in part, to strengthen the modest outcomes of both by capitalizing on the strengths (and ameliorating the weaknesses) of each approach (Bradshaw et al, 2014; Jones et al, 2014; Osher et al, 2010).³⁴

³⁴ For instance, PBIS doesn’t teach social-emotional skills, skills that likely enable and constrain students’ abilities to meet behavioral expectations (Jones et al., 2014). SEL does address these important competencies but has few interventions to manage disruptive behavior. Moreover, PBIS would benefit from the adoption of high-quality SEL program curricula. For example, by providing explicit and embedded teaching strategies that teachers can adopt as common practices, SEL would increase the consistency and predictability across classroom and school settings (Bradshaw et al., 2014; Osher et al., 2010). On the other hand, aspects of PBIS (focus on monitoring, data-based decision making, tiered supports) could be used to make SEL competencies part of schoolwide expectations, guide the selection of SEL programs at each tier and address students’ needs that remain despite universal SEL programming (Bradshaw et al., 2014; Osher et al., 2010).

PBIS and SEL share several similarities. For instance, both are universal interventions, support the use of evidence-based strategies, encourage the participation of all stakeholders, are well supported by rich theoretical and research bases, and focus on the prevention of problem behaviors (Bradshaw et al., 2014; Osher et al., 2010).

However, these approaches also differ substantively in their theoretical foundations, objectives, and methods. Whereas the theoretical foundation of PBIS is behavioral theory vis à vis applied behavioral analysis, SEL draws from diverse theoretical roots such as prevention, resilience, youth development, and several branches of psychology (e.g., positive, developmental, and community) (Bradshaw et al., 2014; Osher et al., 2010).

Furthermore, the objectives of SEL and PBIS (and the methods used to achieve them) also differ. The objective of PBIS is to redesign the school as an organization, focusing on the creation of systems and procedures to prevent and manage student behavior. Compared to SEL, PBIS is more adult-centered and uses behavioral techniques (rewards and consequences) to elicit adherence to external school rules (Bradshaw et al., 2014; Osher et al., 2010). Other methods used in SEL include communicating, teaching, monitoring, and reinforcing an explicit set of rules and responses to misbehavior (Bradshaw et al., 2014; Osher et al., 2010). The objective of SEL, on the other hand, is to develop discrete competencies related to the five domains of social and emotional learning. SEL focuses primarily on developing students' internal capacities to regulate their own behavior and in establishing positive, trusting relationships between teachers and students, and between students and their peers (Bradshaw et al., 2014; Jones et al., 2014; Osher et al., 2010).

Implications for classroom management. SEL approaches to classroom management such as DD differ in substantive ways from traditional approaches to classroom management. Traditional or modal approaches to classroom management emphasize external and teacher (or other adult) control, and they view establishing and maintaining order a means to foster academic learning. SEL, on the other hand, focuses on internal control (e.g., self-control and self-discipline) and views classroom management as an opportunity to *foster learning*, particularly of SEL skills. As such, SEL focuses on classroom management as a tool to teach students self-regulation, self-discipline, and self-control. Additionally, SEL's approach to classroom management emphasizes preventative and proactive strategies (e.g., routines,

structures, classroom organization, etc.) over reactive strategies (e.g., punitive consequences), building students' skills and positive, trusting relationships.

Knowing students: Understanding adolescent development and meeting students' needs. All three sources of evidence emphasized that teachers' knowing students and meeting their developmental (and individual) needs were foundational to the DD approach in general (and its approach to classroom management in particular). As one DD leader explained, "We need to know the answer to, 'Who is this child that's in front of me?' When we know that, we can work with that." DD practices and structures were devised, primarily, as a way to help teachers know, build relationships with, and meet the four developmental needs of middle school students.

Knowing students has two dimensions. One dimension involves having an understanding of adolescent development and psychology (or the "science of child development") and, by extension, the needs of middle school aged students. The *Developmental Designs 1 Resource Book* (2012) describes the adolescent developmental trajectories (physical, social-emotional, intellectual and personal) for each grade level (5-9). These trajectories are synthesized into a set of normative, comprehensive needs for middle school-aged children. These four needs include:

1. Relationship: I want to connect to other people;
2. Autonomy: I want to be independent;
3. Competence: I want to experience success in what I do and feel like a worthwhile person; and
4. Fun: I want to have a good time (*Developmental Designs 1 Resource Book*, 2012, p. 19).

Another, though less emphasized, dimension of knowing students involves knowing students as individuals (e.g., their individual strengths, weaknesses, and needs). Individual needs are encapsulated in individual "student profiles." Rather than being a formal document, student profiles signify knowledge that is informally gathered by the teacher over time. Individual student profiles include information regarding a student's personal life situation, cultural context, strengths and weakness, and individual needs (expressed and unexpressed).

"A relationship (and community)-based approach to teaching and learning." All three sources state explicitly that DD is a relationship- and community-based approach to teaching and learning. "Relationship" and "supportive community" are considered to be one of the three rings

of the DD approach and engaged learner. The Developmental Designs 1 Resource Book (2012) states that, “It is within *relationships* that you can successfully encourage and support the best academic and social performance possible for that child at that time” (p. 15). One DD leader’s definition of community was “a place where students’ needs are met,” “a place where relationships are successful,” and where classroom rules (and norms) are democratically created, shared and maintained.

“Relationship” and “community” were oft-repeated words used to describe the DD approach. In fact, all of DD’s practices are “based on the premise that the healthier the relationships in a school, the more successful students can be both academically and socially (*Developmental Designs 1 Resource Book*, 2012, p. 3). One DD leader explained the impact of teacher-student relationships on what students are able and willing to do:

It’s all about relationships. I’ve seen the differences in classrooms in different schools, teachers that implement DD and teachers that don’t. It’s absolutely night and day. The respect for the teacher and what the teacher is able to get out of those students, is incredible compared to a classroom where the teacher just delivers content, pours it into the kids, and doesn’t have any kind of relationship. They don’t feel safe. They don’t feel like they can trust anyone there. They’re not willing to take risks. They don’t have relationships with their classmates. Social interaction is a huge part of the learning process and if the kids don’t have relationships with the teacher and each other, it’s not going to happen.

Another DD described the DD approach, and SEL in general, as complimenting education’s current (over)emphasis on academics:

It’s social-emotional, so it’s hitting on the other side of the academic.

Teachers spend massive amounts of time learning curriculum, and we’re saying you need to spend the same amount of time getting to know your kids and building relationships with them, because if you don’t have that, it’s not a trusting environment and the academic achievement cannot be where it could be. That’s a big foundational piece there.

Importantly, “relationship” and “community” were most often discussed in relation to one another. DD literature and DD leaders both relayed that the relationships that DD envisions

between teachers and students and among students themselves can only occur within a caring, supportive community.

Approach to Classroom Management

What has been written thus far serves as a descriptive lens through which to view and understand DD's specific design for classroom management and the capabilities for practice it requires. DD's approach to classroom management is tightly linked to its overarching motivation (increasing educational and societal equity) and goals (e.g., cultivating responsible independence, reducing suspensions and expulsions and ensuing loss of instructional time), operating premises, guiding principles, and prominent underpinnings (i.e. SEL, adolescent development and needs, and relationship and community approach to teaching and learning). One DD leader explicitly connects DD's approach to classroom management to its foundational underpinnings described above:

The overarching theme is integrating social skills and academic components and the result being teaching self-discipline, which leads to responsible independence, which leads to more equity. You have to have a level of self-discipline to be able to be responsibly independent. How that plays out in the classroom is what our work are work and our mission is.

All sources of evidence identify DD's design for classroom management as consisting of three key features: (a) a needs-based perspective on the drivers and remedies of student (mis)behavior; (b) teaching kids self-discipline and other SEL skills and attitudes (rather than simply disciplining students); and (c) a relationship-based perspective on managing student (mis)behavior.

Needs-based perspective on student (mis)behavior. DD's philosophy of classroom management includes a needs-based perspective concerning the root causes of student (mis)behavior. Student behavior is viewed as being driven by needs. This perspective is critical to understanding both causes of misbehavior and appropriate teacher responses to it. Meeting students' developmental and individual needs, and teachings students how to appropriately have their needs met, are considered prerequisites to student success (e.g., academic, social, behavioral). Likewise, to the extent that they go unmet they are considered explanatory variables in student failure.

Student behavior—both good and bad—is viewed as emanating from met and unmet needs, respectively. A DD leader captures how the needs-based perspective is key to understanding its approach to classroom management:

That would be another underpinning: that we believe behaviors are driven by needs. Why do kids do what they do or behave the way they behave? Because they're seeking to get needs met. Many times, their behavior is just an inappropriate way to meet a need. So part of what we do with teachers is help them understand that's just what kids do; it's not about who they are.

Because misbehavior is caused by unmet needs, classroom management becomes the way by which students are taught the habits, skills, and attitudes to meet their needs appropriately.

Goal: Developing students' pro-social, SEL skills and attitudes. DD conceives of classroom management as part of an overall plan for the development of internalized habits and pro-social, SEL skills and attitudes. The primary goal of DD's approach to classroom management, and the relationship between this goal and DD's design, is explicitly stated in the *Developmental Designs 1 Resource Book* (2012): "Given the principles, research, and beliefs under which we operate, the *Developmental Designs* approach requires that we work out of a particular paradigm: Our job is not to discipline children, but to teach children discipline" (p.55).

DD conceptualizes "discipline" as a subject to be taught, and misbehavior as an opportunity to teach discipline rather than as a set of punitive consequences used to regain control over students. Cultivating students' self-control is done through reinforcing, developing, and teaching the SEL skills and attitudes required for good behavior, rather than through the typical approach of teacher control, punishments and rewards.

All sources of evidence included the oft-repeated refrain that classroom management is first and foremost about "*teaching* kids discipline, rather than disciplining kids" (*Developmental Designs 1 Resource Book*, 2012, p. 10). For instance, one DD leader described how self-control is something that must be skillfully cultivated *within* students over time:

The way to self-control? ...I can't give someone control. *Self*-control, by definition, means I can't give it to somebody. *Self*-esteem, *self*-directed learning, *self*-control; all those "selves," I can't deliver. I have to help kids uncover them, which means a whole different way of being with kids in the classroom (original emphasis).

DD leaders also described equipping teachers with the necessary tools to cultivate students' self-control as central to their work. One DD leader described their collective work as "helping teachers help kids learn self-discipline":

The idea of teaching self-discipline becomes real important...kids need to be able to self-discipline, to be in control in the class without me needing to be in control of them...what are all the practices that go with that?...How do I do that?...that's where we spend our time--helping teachers help kids learn self-discipline.

Lastly, DD leaders reiterated how focusing on developing students' self-control is integral to DD's broader goal of cultivating students' responsible independence. As explained by one leader, "Teaching self-discipline...leads to responsible independence. You have to have a level of self-discipline to be able to be responsibly independent. How it plays out in the classroom is what our work is about."

Relationship-based perspective on managing student (mis)behavior. The needs-based perspective on student misbehavior, coupled with the goal of cultivating students' SEL skills and attitudes, necessitates a relational approach to preventing and responding to misbehavior. The phrases "relational discipline" and a "relationship-based" were used across all three sources of evidence to describe DD's approach to managing student behavior. As previously stated, DD posits that is within relationships that the academic and social needs and growth of students is best encouraged and realized.

DD's underlying philosophy emphasizes the need to build trusting teacher-student relationships that meet needs rather than reliance on teachers' formal authority and external methods of control (e.g., punishment, rewards). Furthermore, all sources of evidence support the idea that classroom management is enabled and constrained by the presence or lack of healthy, teacher-student relationships. One DD leader described why the teacher-student relationship was at the heart of DDs approach to student discipline:

Discipline is founded on relationship. It has to be relational because how will I help my kids learn what's works for them and their discipline, if I don't know my kids? ...If you don't have a relationship...there's not a possibility for that to happen. So, really all this work is predicated on the fact that you have relationships with your kids.

Another DD leader describes how building teacher-student relationships is integral to developing the type of classroom community where students take charge:

Because of the ability, need and desire for them to be in charge, you have to, by design, have relationships because of the fact that you're going to allow these kids to be taking over the classroom.

DD describes the desired teacher-student relationship as “positive, trusting” and default teacher-student relationships as based on “domination and punishment” (*Developmental Designs 1 Resource Book*, 2012, p. 2). Importantly, while the former is cultivated through implementation of the DD approach, the former was described as the normative teacher-student relationship in most American classrooms.

“A Practical Approach”: DD’s Ten Core Practices and Structures

It is about helping teachers understand our philosophical approach as well as a practical approach. I think why our work is so different from many other approaches out there, is because we have a very significant philosophical approach, but we also have very practical ways to deliver this philosophical underpinning...We take an abstract concept...and winnow it down to the very specific practices you can use.

-DD leader, interview, May 17, 2015

Central to DD’s design for classroom management practice are what it calls its ten core practices. These practices are the embodiment of the DD approach to defining and enabling classroom management practice. As described in the *Developmental Designs 1 Resource Book* (2012):

To accomplish the integration of social and academic learning, teachers need practical structures that will carry them from the beginning of each day to dismissal, from establishing order in a caring community in September to upholding that order in June (p. 4).

These practices are codified in DD literature (e.g., resource books, website), form the basis of workshop training, and are discussed as the fundamental support of practice by DD leaders.

DD’s ten core practices include: advisory, goal setting, social contract, modeling and practicing, the loop, empowering language, pathways to self-control, collaborative problem-solving, power of play, and practices for motivating instruction. Based on the content of DD workshops and resource books (and interviews with DD leaders), these ten practices can be

thought as falling into three categories: advisory, classroom culture and management (Goal Setting thru Power of Play), and classroom instruction (Practices for Motivating Instruction).³⁵

Below is a summary description of each DD practice:

1. Advisory: A daily, structured morning meeting involving students and a single teacher. Its purpose is to engage in relationship and community building as well as increasing students' SEL skills and attitudes.
2. Goal Setting: Students develop a set of goals and declarations related to their short and long term academic and nonacademic aspirations. These are meant to motivate them as well as guide their decisions and behavior;
3. Social Contract: This is a document that explicates a consensus-based set of agreements for classroom behavior. The Social contract is a "live" document in that it serves as a referent for creating and maintaining community.
4. Modeling and Practicing: explicating, demonstrating, and practicing expected classroom rules, behaviors, and routines on an ongoing basis;
5. The Loop: An unending loop, or process, for enabling student planning and reflection. The Loop is used to reflect on classroom activities, behavior, or group dynamics.
6. Empowering Language: The intentional use of language types (e.g. gesture, tone, word choice) that help build students responsible independence;
7. Pathways to Self-control: A set of responses (called "redirections") to misbehavior that help redirect, or guide, students back to self-control. Each of the pathways (or redirections) is designed to grow students' SEL skills and attitudes, including fostering their self-control and self-discipline. These redirections, or pathways, also aim to redress misbehavior while also maintaining positive and nurturing teacher-student relationships.

³⁵ The DD1 workshop and Developmental Designs 1 Resource Book (2012) are dedicated to Advisory and DD's approach to classroom management (Advisory thru Power of Play practices). Additionally, Advisory, Modeling and Practicing Routines, Empowering Language, and Pathways to Self-Control are also covered in the follow-up workshops and accompanying resource books (discussed later in this chapter). The 10th core DD practice, "Practices for Motivating Instruction," is the focus of DD2 workshop training and the Developmental Designs 2 Resource Book (2012). Like DD's approach to classroom management, DD's approach to classroom instruction consists of a number of practices and structures. At the time of this study, no follow-up workshops had been developed for DD2 practices.

8. Collaborative Problem-Solving³⁶: A set of conferencing structures used to get to know students and help them problem-solve and restore their self-control following repeated misbehavior.
9. Power of Play³⁷: “Play is designed to build community, sharpen thinking skills, and enliven students while restoring their focus on learning” (Developmental Designs Fact Sheet, n.d.).
10. Practices for Motivating Instruction: A set of instructional strategies that integrate SEL with academic content.

In order to be considered a DD practitioner (or “DD Champion”), one must enact all ten practices with fidelity.

DD leaders reported that the first nine DD practices were approaches to what they referred to as proactive and reactive discipline. DD leaders defined proactive discipline as the use of DD practices and structures that aim to prevent misbehavior and reactive discipline as the use of those DD practices that aim to correct misbehavior. All three DD leaders described teachers’ implementation of Advisory, Goal Setting, Social Contract, Modeling and Practicing, The Loop, and Power of Play as proactive discipline and The Pathways to Self-control and Collaborative Problem-solving as reactive discipline.

Advisory is considered a microcosm for implementation of all DD practices. Also, Advisory allows teachers to get to know and develop positive student-teacher relationships and to meet students’ developmental needs (relationship, autonomy, competence, fun). Modeling and Practicing meets students’ needs for autonomy and competency by equipping them with the knowledge and skills to comply with classroom routines. Likewise, Social Contract and Goal Setting invite student endorsement and investment in classroom expectations and school generally. Finally, The Pathways to Self-control and Collaborative Problem-Solving guide students back to self-control in a way that helps develop their SEL skills and attitudes.

DD’s Design for Classroom Management as Drastic Shifts in Teacher Practice

³⁶ Although Collaborative Problem-solving is listed as a *separate* core DD practice, the Developmental Designs 1 Resource Book (2012) and training considers it as another Pathway to Self-Control.

³⁷ Power of Play is listed as a separate core DD practice on DD’s website and in the Developmental Designs 1 Resource Book (2012). However, beyond the definition given above, it is unclear differentiates it from other core practices.

DD leaders described DD's design for classroom management in terms of the change it requires for most teachers' classroom management philosophy and practice. All three DD leaders stated that DD's approach to classroom management was a much more significant change for teachers than its approach to classroom instruction. In describing the difficulties faced from moving from DD1 workshop training to classroom implementation, one DD leader stated: "Philosophically, it's easy to comprehend. The actual doing of it is really, really hard."

All three DD leaders emphasized three major moves in practice: (a) from teacher-control and coercion to shared power and self-control; (b) from discipline as an action to a domain of knowledge; and (c) from systematic responses to misbehavior to "personalizing discipline."

From Discipline as an Action to a Domain of Knowledge

DD leaders reported that its core classroom management philosophy represented a pronounced shift in teachers' understanding and practice with respect to the meaning of "discipline".

First, DD's core classroom management philosophy—teaching students discipline, rather than disciplining students—requires teachers to first understand discipline as a domain of knowledge rather than as a set of actions. Reflecting on her experience training hundreds of teachers, a DD leader describes this conceptualization of discipline as rather novel for most schools and teachers:

I don't think discipline is taken as a subject to be *taught* in schools. Even though we keep going back to "it's about relationships" and "it's about teaching these social skills so they can be successful," discipline, in the mindset of teachers, is something we *do* to kids who are misbehaving, not an opportunity to teach (original emphasis).

In sum, DD requires that teachers conceive of discipline as a subject to be taught and misbehavior as an opportunity to introduce students to, and help them to master, SEL skills and attitudes.

From Teacher Control and Coercion to Self-control and Shared Power

Building students' self-control and other SEL skills and attitudes also requires teachers to move away from a classroom culture based on teacher control to one based on shared power, student voice, and endorsement. A DD leader explains how the shift from the hierarchical classroom culture found in most schools to the democratic classroom community DD proposes is among the most drastic shifts required by most teachers:

I think the biggest shift in practice for middle school teachers is the classroom management piece because many of them come from an autocratic background where the teacher is in control. You're not sharing authority with the kids. It's a top-down management piece and this is different. This ask you to step out of that box and to say: "We're going to be partners here and we're going to interact with our students in a different way and we're going to empower them, instead of control them." For a lot of middle school teachers, that's a big shift for them.

Relatedly, DD's approach to classroom management also requires that teachers move away from tools that support modal discipline systems—tickets, demerits, punitive consequences, and even praise—that externalize discipline and prop up teacher control. One DD leader described how these systems were typical in most schools and classrooms: "What makes it so interesting is I have been in probably 100 or 200 middle schools. I can't think of one that does not manage their kids through punishment and rewards. It's how we roll in this country."

From Systematic Responses to Misbehavior to "Personalizing Discipline"

Building self-control also requires that teachers move away from systematic responses to misbehavior and, instead, respond to misbehavior in ways that are child- and situation-specific. One DD leader described the nature of progressive discipline, a ubiquitous approach to discipline used by many schools and teachers, as "one of the biggest hurdles to overcome":

One of the biggest hurdles to overcome in typical middle and high schools is that, if you go to most schools, it's a discipline plan that lists what the student might do and then what the offense is. Well, the first offense is this...the second this...the third this...it's very sequential and logical.

Another DD leader added that the shift that is required by teachers is to learn how, instead, to personalize discipline for each child, behavior, and situation:

I think the hard part to for teachers, as I see it from going into schools, is getting the idea of personalizing discipline. The teachers, some certainly are very adept at this, but teachers not thinking of the reactive side as one, two, three, and you're out.

In sum, DD-trained teachers are asked to respond to misbehavior with responses that are more fluid, less punitive, and more student-centered. As explained by a DD leader, "There are many pathways to self-control and the question is what pathways does a child need for his/her self-control."

DD's Capabilities for Classroom Management Practice

Put simply, capabilities for practice can be defined as those resources that enable one to carry out a task as desired. The tasks that typically define the field of teaching naturally vary in type and grain size. A few tasks commonly accepted as primary in the work of teaching include managing classroom behavior, instructional planning, and assessing student learning. These, and other types of primary teaching tasks, draw on different capabilities. For example, the capabilities for practice needed to manage classroom behavior are different than those needed to assess student learning. Additionally, primary teaching tasks contain smaller, secondary tasks (and perhaps tertiary and so on) embedded within them. For example, one task embedded within instructional planning—daily lesson planning—can include secondary tasks such as planning for a whole-class lecture, a group learning activity, *and* an independent learning activity. Like different primary teaching tasks, secondary tasks embedded within them can also draw on different capabilities. What is important is that, as the above scenario begins to illustrate, capabilities for practice for any given task can be deconstructed into constituent elements or components that all interact to enable desirable teaching practice for that particular task.

My definition of *creating* capabilities for practice is helping practitioners acquire the requisite knowledge, skills, and tools to enable them to perform in new and desirable ways. In the context of this study, capabilities for practice are those resources that enable teachers to enact the DD design for classroom management.

DD does not have a single document or source that explicates in detail the capabilities needed to enact the design in classrooms. As such, I constructed a profile of these capabilities using three sources of evidence. My primary source was the Developmental Designs 1 Resource Book (2012). The Developmental Designs 1 Resource Book (2012) represents the principal codification of DD's underlying principles and goals, ten core practices, and DD1 workshop training content. According to the Developmental Designs 1 Resource Book (2012), relationship-based behavior management always includes the following:

- Know your students;
- Build and maintain good relationships with them;
- Create a community;
- Declare the hopes of the community;
- Establish agreements for the community;

- Model and practice the way those agreements should look, sound, and feel;
 - Maintain community through re-modeling, empowering language, and the power of play;
 - Correct every break in the rules; and
 - When students make mistakes, use one or more of your tools to adjust the environment and restore self-control while preserving the relationship
- (*Developmental Designs 1 Resource Book*, 2012, p. 136).

I complemented my analysis of the Developmental Designs 1 Resource Book (2012)—including the bulleted points above—with that of DD leader reports and field notes from my participation in the DD1 weeklong training. Based on this analysis, my primary claim is that the capabilities to enact DD in classrooms lie in a combination of: (a) dispositional traits (i.e. teacher mindsets); (b) (/conceptual/foundational knowledge of the DD design; and (c) procedural skill/practical knowledge.

Dispositional Traits: “Teacher Mindset(s)”

The first constituent capability of practice identified by leaders (but omitted in the DD1 training and resource manual) were *teacher mindsets*. Teacher mindsets are dispositional in nature in that they refer to teachers’ internalized attitudes and beliefs rather than, for instance, knowledge of the DD design or practical skill. A DD leader referred to them broadly as “the mindset of the person who is in a classroom” and “the way you need to come to the work.” According to DD leaders and program documentation (*Developmental Designs 2 Resource Book*, 2012), teacher mindsets are critical to enact DD as intended because of the influence teacher mindsets exert on teacher understanding (of the DD design, individual practices, etc.), decision-making, and behavior.³⁸ As such, teacher mindsets are requisite capabilities necessary to attain the other constituent capabilities of practice. As one DD leader succinctly explained: “You can read the philosophical statement and practices. Right? But for you to be actually able to carry forth with the philosophy and the practices, there are mindsets.”

Three teacher mindsets—growth, action, and objective—were identified in DD program documentation and by DD leaders as critical to enacting the DD approach. DD leaders described

³⁸ Teachers in interviews explicitly made references to the influence of teacher mindsets on DD practice. Teachers attributed the success and failure of DD in shaping teachers’ practice(s) to individual teacher’s mindset. This was particularly the case among teachers who described themselves as highly committed to DD in describing the struggles of some of their colleagues in implementing DD in their advisories and classrooms.

these three mindsets as largely evolving from the work of Carol Dweck, particularly her work on the growth mindset (Dweck, 2017). Below is a brief summary explanation of each mindset included in the Developmental Designs 2 Resource Book (2012):

1. Growth mindset: the space of possibility that we hold for others (students) and ourselves. It is created by our belief in our natural capacity for growth;
2. Action mindset: facilitates the active support of others (students) through good times and bad. It demands a commitment of heart and mind. Fueled by courage and a sense of urgency to quickly and consistently identify and address problems; and
3. Objective mindset: the ability to interact with others (students) without taking what they do and say personally (pp. 99-100).

DD leaders emphasized the importance of all three teacher mindsets being present for DD to be implemented as intended.

Although isolated into three discrete teacher mindsets, DD leaders described these mindsets as functioning interdependently in enabling and constraining teacher thinking, behavior, and language. This was not only with respect to both teachers' interactions with students but, importantly, their perspectives on their own professional practice, sense of self-efficacy, and locus of control and response to professional criticism and feedback.

For instance, one DD leader explained how the growth and action mindsets worked in tandem in enabling teachers to first believe in the possibility of student growth and then take responsibility for taking the actions necessary to bring growth about:

The growth mindset is...the ability to think that who a kid is now, is not who he or she will become...The action mindset is: "if it is going to be, it's up to me"... rather than "someone else can deal with this problem, not me," whether it'd be parents or administrators. So we're really focused on teachers being active participants.

Additionally, another DD leader described how the growth and objective mindsets worked together to enable teachers to evaluate and change their own practice; something DD leaders reported was required by many teachers implementing the approach:

The idea that I don't need to take what happens in my classroom personally is really part of the growth mindset. Because the objective mindset means, "It's not about *me*, it's about my practice. I am *not* my practice. Wherever I think I came from, it's okay to make a mistake and to apologize the kids and to not always know the right answer.

Lastly, one DD leader described how the absence of the action mindset, in particular, jeopardized DD implementation, and by extension, desired outcomes:

We can have people come to the workshop and have a growth mindset and really take it all in, love it and really see how it can be successful in their school and in their classroom. But unless they can get to the action mindset, actually walking the walk and not just talking the talk, they're not going to get the results that they're hoping for.

In sum, the presence or absence of these specific teacher mindsets was described by DD leaders as enabling and constraining the development of other constituent capabilities of practice, particularly the development of procedural skills and practical knowledge.

Foundational Knowledge

Knowledge of DD's design, particularly its foundational underpinnings (described in detail above), emerged as the second component of practice. In addition to requisite teacher mindsets, understanding and enactment of the DD design for classroom management requires sufficient understanding of DD's knowledge base and aims. As stated in the Developmental Designs 1 Resource Book (2012): "any response to student misbehavior is based on the philosophy of the responder" (p. 111). As previously cited by a DD leader, DD is a "very significant philosophical approach" in that it is informed by an amalgam of theory, research and social justice orientations. Below, a leader explained the relationship between knowledge of the DD design and teacher practice:

It's about...*why* we do what we do...we can tell them all these things but if they don't understand *why* they're doing it...like how adolescent brain research helped us support the practices of DD, then we're just giving them something that doesn't really have value (original emphasis).

This type of knowledge was strongly emphasized across all three sources of evidence.

Procedural Skill/Practical Knowledge

Lastly, procedural skills and practical knowledge leverage teachers' dispositional traits (i.e. mindsets) and understanding of DD's design (e.g., foundational knowledge) into a set of teacher roles, actions or behaviorism, and skillsets. Whereas the previous component of practice—foundational knowledge—described what DD-trained teachers should know, procedural skills and practical knowledge consist of what they should be able to do. In sum, this

component of practice is largely synonymous with teachers' understanding of, and ability to, enact DD's ten core practices.

The procedural skills and practical knowledge called for by DD's approach to classroom management included the abilities to: (a) create classroom environments that meet students' developmental needs; (b) build (and maintain) positive teacher-student relationships; (c) teach students self-control (i.e. prevent misbehavior and respond to misbehavior); (d) employ teacher language; and (e) build (democratic) classroom community (e.g., gain student endorsement).

Importantly, these skills and practical knowledge map explicitly onto content included in the Developmental Designs 1 Resource Book (2012) and workshop training outline. Furthermore, these performance capabilities overlap and are interdependent with one another. For instance, teaching self-control occurs within positive teacher-student relationships, which occur within an intentionally designed building classroom community. Additionally, gaining student endorsement is an important part of intentionally designing democratic classroom community. Teacher language is a capability that cuts across each of these performance capabilities.

How to create classroom environments that meet students' developmental needs. In order to effectively manage student behavior, teachers must first be able to intentionally design a classroom environment that allows students to learn and experience the four adolescent needs (autonomy, competence, relationships, and fun). Having an intellectual understanding of what these needs are and why they are important is necessary but not sufficient. Rather, as other aspects of the DD design, such knowledge is to be employed in all facets of teacher decision-making. Reflecting on recent research on adolescent development, one DD leader explains how organizing classrooms according to these needs is both critical to student success and atypical in middle school classrooms:

The height of the need for autonomy was 14 years old. What's that mean for us as teachers of middle schoolers? Have you ever been to a kindergarten class and seen the amount of choice they get in their day?" The whole day is one big choice... You go into an eighth grade classroom and pretty much it's, "Sit down, and do what I ask you to do." You wonder why we have mutiny in middle schools? Because we're not giving kids enough chance to be independent. If you would say, "What is the end game?" I would say that we create classrooms in which kids can have their need for autonomy, and thus

competence, and vice versa are met...The end game is developing classrooms where their needs are met, in significant ways.

Teachers leverage knowledge of students' developmental and individual needs to organize their classrooms, academically, socially and behaviorally.

How to build (and maintain) positive teacher-student relationships. Building teacher-student relationships a key procedural/practical skill for two reasons. First, almost every aspect of the DD approach—from designing classroom community to understanding students' needs and guiding students to self-control—hinges on the existence of quality relationships between teachers and students. Second, the type of teacher-student relationships specified by DD requires deliberate cultivation on the part of teachers.

As previously discussed, all sources of evidence referenced research supporting that healthy classroom community, student behavior, and teachers' classroom management success were all enabled and constrained by the quality of teacher-student relationships. Additionally, DD proposes a teacher-student relationship based on positivity, trust, and shared power, rather than coercion, authority, and hierarchy. This type of teacher-student relationship is unlikely to develop organically and, instead, requires ongoing, deliberate decision-making and commitment on the part of teachers. As stated in the manual: "If there aren't structures to support...relationship-building, they won't happen...they are built deliberately, piece by piece, out of every encounter between one person and another" (p. 25).

How to teach students self-control. The procedural skill most directly linked to classroom management is the ability to teach students self-control. Teaching students self-control revolves around two concepts: one, how to teach expected behavior (or prevent misbehavior); and two, how to respond to instances of misbehavior. According to the Developmental Design 1 Resource Book (2012):

They need to learn from us how, when, and why to behave in certain ways and to follow certain rules *before* they do them. Then if they make mistakes, we use tools to re-establish discipline to guide them to restoring their self-control (original emphasis, *Developmental Designs 1 Resource Book*, 2012, p. 55).

Both teaching expected behaviors and strategically responding to misbehavior allow for students to learn and internalize self-control as well as other SEL skills, attitudes and habits.

These two aspects of teaching self-control are addressed in “Establishing Order” and “Maintaining Order” sections of the Developmental Designs 1 Resource Book (2012).

How to prevent misbehavior. All sources of evidence emphasized that misbehavior was prevented, in part, by establishing, teaching and re-teaching expected norms of behavior. All three sources also included a version of the refrain: “We begin at the beginning, making no assumptions, teaching everything” (*Developmental Designs 1 Resource Book*, 2012, p. 55). At the core of “teaching everything” is developing explicit expectations and routines for most every facet of classroom life followed by frequent monitoring and re-teaching as necessary. Teaching self-control also involves gaining student endorsement for classroom rules, routines, and classroom management practices and structures. As explained in the Developmental Designs 1 Resource Book (2012):

We're giving them voice into where they want to go and we're reacting to that academically as well as helping them with the discipline...the social skills they need to accomplish their own goals.

How to respond to misbehavior. As stated in the Developmental Designs 1 Resource Book (2012), “it is not the teacher’s job to *resolve* the gap [between desired student behavior and actual behavior], but to acknowledge it and help students navigate their way to a mature, respectful behavior pattern (original emphasis, p. 65). Teachers must be able to respond to instances of misbehavior in ways that facilitate students’ internalization of SEL skills, attitudes, and habits (rather than simply restore order and teacher control).

The Developmental Designs 1 Resource Book (2012) describes how teachers must use their knowledge of students’ individual and developmental needs to guide students to self-control:

We can look to see what are the needs most dominating the behavior of each student...providing useful data for decision-making. You can determine...what type of redirection works best with that student and what has to happen for a student before she will become productive, by looking to see which needs are driving her behavior, positive or negative (*Developmental Designs 1 Resource Book*, 2012, p. 19)

Relatedly, another DD leader describes how joint-problem solving between teachers and students, following an instance of misbehavior, is key in developing student skill in self-control:

What I want to do is really listen to "Why did you do that?" If that was the reason, how do we remove that catalyst? How do we help you understand, or change your mind, about how you feel about that factor that caused you to do that. Now we're trying to use reasoning with our students and helping them become thinkers about their own actions. What we're trying to do is teach discipline, or self-regulation, instead of doing it to them. Discipline becomes something that we're continuously teaching as we're helping them through their mistakes instead of just making a discipline an action.

What the above quotes point to is that, rather than coercing compliance, responses to misbehavior are the very medium by which SEL skills necessary for good behavior—cooperation, assertion, responsibility, empathy, self-control/self-discipline, self-regulation and self-monitoring—are taught, reinforced, and internalized.

How to employ teacher language. The need for teachers to be able to intentionally and skillfully employ (and restrain) their language is a core skill that is threaded across all aspects of the DD approach (and its supports). Because of this, one DD leader refers to teacher language as “the base of it all.”

The importance of teacher language is addressed across all three sources but especially within the Developmental Designs 1 Resource Book (2012) and training content. It is important to every aspect of the DD approach. Teacher language is employed in everything from building classroom community to managing classroom discussion to responding to students’ misbehavior. It is also the focus of one of the three Developmental Designs 1 Resource Book (2012) chapters (“Empowering Language”), which speak directly to managing classroom behavior. As explained in the Developmental Designs 1 Resource Book (2012): “The way we talk to young people has everything to do with how they respond...Language is the vehicle with which we maintain and nurture those relationships, and skillful, intentional use of it can save the day” (p. 87).

How to build (democratic) classroom community. DD’s entire approach—including its approach to classroom management—hinges on teachers’ ability to design a very specific type of classroom community. The type of classroom community envisioned by DD is intentional with respect to both process (e.g., teacher practice) and product (i.e. characteristics of classroom community).

Building classroom community was emphasized across all three sources. This includes a dedicated section in the Developmental Designs 1 Resource Book (2012), inclusion as one of

three DD1 workshop goals and leader reports. One DD leader described how its design for practice is aimed at developing an intentional classroom community capable of meeting students' needs:

We're trying to create a very specific type of classroom community in which you are a certain way with kids. You have certain beliefs about kids, your goals, about the way you manage, when mistakes are made, how do you deal with it, how do you speak to kids, how you deliver content to kids. We're trying to build a very specific classroom where students' needs are met.

DD's approach for classroom management requires that student discipline not operate in a vacuum but within teacher-student relationship. That relationship, in turn, functions within the intentionally designed community described above.

How to gain "student endorsement." Teachers must be able to elicit what DD calls "student endorsement." This is the ability to leverage student voice, buy-in, and consensus. The importance of student endorsement is explicitly emphasized across sources of evidence. It is also central to most aspects of the DD approach.

Student endorsement is the byproduct of "placing a high value on their ideas and concerns and...consistently seeking student input (*Developmental Designs 1 Resource Book*, 2012, p. 20)." As described in the *Developmental Designs 1 Resource Book* (2012), gaining student endorsement for specific rules, procedures, norms, and redirections helps improve student buy-in and commitment:

The best way to motivate people to behave in a certain way is to get them to endorse a rationale for doing so. When this internal endorsement happens...the desired behavior gets internalized, becomes a part of who that person is, and has a much better chance of impacting their behavior (p. 20).

Another DD leader explained the importance of gaining student endorsement through the lens of improving skill acquisition:

We look at this endorsement piece continuously, at this young adolescent level. In order to transform their minds into the adult mind of "accountability," they need to buy-in into the skills that they need to be successful in as adults.

DD considers student endorsement to be important not only with respect to classroom management but in all aspects of DD. For instance, the desired classroom community

(democratic), teacher-student relationship (shared power) and goals of classroom management (internalized habits rather than externalized control) each require students' ongoing involvement and authentic participation.

Discussion

In the sections above, I have described both DD's design for classroom management as well as the constituent capabilities for practice it demands. These capabilities are embedded within the Developmental Designs 1 Resource Book (2012) and DD1 training content, the two primary resources that codify and transmit the DD approach for classroom management. This analysis was also substantiated by reports from DD1 leaders, one of whom helped co-write and design iterations of the Developmental Designs 1 Resource Book (2012) (and other DD literature) as well as related workshop trainings.

I categorized capabilities for classroom management practice embedded in these sources of evidence as: (a) teacher mindset(s); (b) foundational knowledge; and (c) procedural skill/practical knowledge. This classification scheme arose from my analysis of sources in answering the question: "What are DD-trained teachers supposed to know and be able to do with respect to classroom management?"

Interesting relationships between and within these constituent capabilities were found, as was an important wrinkle in my analytic framework detailed in Chapter Two. Dispositional traits—teacher mindsets, beliefs, and/or attitudes—were not anticipated in my critical analysis. My definition of capabilities for practice did not account for teacher disposition. Furthermore, I found constituent capabilities of practice to be interdependent rather than exclusively independent. For example, there was much overlap between foundational knowledge (what teachers must know) and procedural knowledge and practical skills (what teachers must know how to do).

Furthermore, this analysis identified several fairly drastic shifts in practice often required on behalf of teachers to implement DD's approach to classroom management. DD leaders identified these shifts in reflecting on their experience providing training, coaching, and consulting services to hundreds of teachers over the last 10-15 years. These shifts are important because they likely have implications for the ways in which teachers perceive and understand DD as well as the ways in which DD training shapes their classroom management practice. Yet these shifts are not explicit in DD materials nor are they made transparent in training content.

CHAPTER V
FINDINGS:
DD's FORMAL AND SOCIAL SUPPORTS OF PRACTICE

Introduction

Analytically, the issue on which this dissertation focuses most closely is how teachers' capabilities for practice are developed by their exposure to formal and social supports of practice. Further, although these categorical supports have often been considered and used exclusively of one another, the primary conjecture of this dissertation is that they are best thought of as mutually interdependent. As such, drawing from my analytic framework, this chapter describes the formal and social supports of practice—and the interaction and synergy (or lack thereof) between these supports – that DD uses in support of developing initial and ongoing DD capabilities.

In answering my first research question, about DD's design for practice, I learned that it emphasizes a specific design for teachers' classroom management practice. This design is both philosophical and theoretical in that it is built on philosophy, theory, and research, yet it is also practical in that it includes a set of discrete teacher practices (i.e. DD's ten core practices). Further, because DD's approach to classroom management represents a dramatic shift from modal school and teacher beliefs and practice, it requires the development of capabilities for practice commensurate with its design. I refer to these capabilities as: (a) dispositional traits (mindsets); (b) foundational knowledge; and (c) procedural skills/practical knowledge.

In this chapter, I take up the next research question: *What formal supports for practice (e.g., first-principles, scripts, routines, supplementary guidance, codified materials) and social supports for practice (e.g., training, internal coaching/consultation, PD, performance feedback) are provided to develop those specific capabilities?* The aim of this question is to understand the key features of DD's formal and social supports for practice as well as interdependencies (or lack thereof) between them.

To answer this question, I analyzed three sources of data: program documentation (e.g., website material and workshop materials), semi-structured interviews with three DD leaders, and fieldnotes from my participation DD's in-depth, weeklong workshop (DD1).

It is important to note that DD's implementation resources can be thought of as existing on two levels. One level consists of formal "media" and social "mediums." By media, I mean "the main means of mass communication" (Oxford Dictionaries Online, 2016). Much of DD's formal media are printed materials, key among them being training manuals known as "resource books." By medium, I mean "an agency or means of doing something" (Oxford Dictionaries Online, 2016) and, in this case, transmitting and improving upon the use of DD through social mediums such as workshop training and coaching. The second level of implementation resources consists of categorical formal and social supports that are *embedded within* DDs formal media and social mediums.

My answer to this research question has three parts. First: DD's formal supports emphasize what I call procedural guidance. By procedural guidance, I mean categories of support that directly assist teachers' in-classroom use and enactment of the DD approach, particularly its ten core practices. Analytical categories of procedural guidance include: (a) structures, strategies, and routines; (b) teacher language scripts; (c) teacher planning and enactment resources; (d) supplementary (cognitive) guidance; and (e) teacher practice exemplars.

Second: Social supports of practice (i.e. workshop training and several coaching models) emphasize what I call training "modalities" which privilege developing teachers' capabilities through experiential learning. DD workshops leverage a common set of training modalities used to support teachers' basic understanding of the DD design and acquisition of the capabilities needed to enact it. By modalities, I mean the specific designs for professional learning employed by workshop designers and facilitators to help participants gain an understanding and facility with the DD approach. These training modalities emphasized social-constructivist approaches to learning within a community. The training modalities employed in DD workshops include: (a) immersion; (b) participant enactment; (c) application; (d) demonstrations and observation; (e) collective sense-making structures; and (f) didactic instruction. Importantly, while workshops are used principally to introduce teachers to the DD design, coaching is designed to develop implementation fidelity and sustainability of the DD approach. Thus, workshop training and coaching are designed to work hand in hand.

Third: While there was a high degree of interdependence between (a) workshop training and procedural guidance and (b) aspects of DD coaching and procedural guidance, less integration was found between (a) other aspects of DD coaching and procedural guidance and (b) the use of workshop training modalities and procedural guidance (in terms of DD's design for reactive/corrective discipline, specifically).

Below, I break my findings into three major headings. The first section describes DD's formal supports of practice. I give an overview of DD's array of print and electronic media in which its procedural guidance (its primary formal support) is contained. I then describe the specific analytical categories of procedural guidance described above. The second section describes DD's social supports of practice. I give an overview of DD's two linchpin social support mediums—workshops (introductory, in-depth and follow-up) and coaching—along with the specific training modalities and coaching models (expert, peer and self-coaching) employed. The third section describes the areas of tight and loose integration among DD's formal and social supports.

DD's Formal Supports of Practice

Key to understanding and transmitting the DD approach are DD's weeklong workshops and resource books. Resource books codify all aspects of the DD design, including its ten core practices. Purchased in tandem with workshops, resource books serve as a training manual and referent for both facilitators and participants.

Furthermore, embedded within these formal media are discrete forms of procedural guidance used to further elucidate and support teachers' enactment of DD's ten core practices. These types of formal supports include procedural guidance, teacher language, ready-to-use resources and supplementary (cognitive) guidance.

Formal Media: Print and Electronic Resources

The major types of formal media supporting DD's approach to classroom management include: (a) printed literature, including workshop manuals and publications and (b) a small number of electronic media.

Print media: Resource books and commercial publications. DD has an array of literature that supports understanding and implementation of the approach. This literature is divided into two categories. One category includes workshop-training manuals known as "resource books". The second category of DD literature includes commercial publications. As

explained by a DD leader, below, these types of publications differ with respect to audience and use:

There are two types of books. There are resource books. The resource books go with the workshops. And then we have publications that you could buy outside the workshops.

We wanted to do two different tracks. One for people who take the workshop and one for those that don't. Those publications are written with a very different audience in mind.

The resource books are not written to be used and read alone. That's the main difference. The intended audiences for resource books are teachers and schools intending to work alongside DD consultants in some capacity (e.g. workshop training). The intended audience of commercial publications are those who wish to engage in individual or site-based learning, absent collaborations with DD.

Resource books. Resource books are the bounded training materials used for workshop training. They are purchased only in conjunction with DD workshops and are not for public sale. There are seven resource books. Each of these resource books is named after the introductory workshop (one book), in-depth workshops (two books), and follow-up workshops they accompany (four books) described in sections below.

Resource books serve three important functions in defining and developing DD capabilities. One, in addition to codifying key classroom management capabilities, resource books also codify formal supports of practice (described in detail in sections below) used to develop these capabilities. Two, and relatedly, resource books act as training manuals and guide the content and activities of workshops, one of DD's chief social supports. Lastly, following workshop training, resource books can also serve as a reference for teachers during classroom implementation.

The DD1 Resource Book (and workshop) is primarily used to define and support the development of classroom management capabilities, specifically. In addition to giving an overview of DD's overarching philosophy, goals, underpinnings and research base, three of its six sections deal directly with managing classroom behavior (i.e. Establishing Order pp. 55-85; Empowering Language pp. 87-105; Maintaining Order and Building Self-control pp. 107-137).

The DD2 Resource Book (and workshop) also contains some material related to classroom management practice. Most of this material is a review of DD1; however, a few classroom additional management practices (not contained in the DD1 Resource Book and

workshop) are also included. Further, the DD2 Resource Book also deals explicitly, though briefly, with the three teacher mindsets (i.e. objective, growth and action mindsets) central to the DD design.

In addition to the DD1 Resource Book, there are also four additional, much briefer, resource books that also support classroom management practice. These resource books support the four follow-up workshops in troubleshooting implementation of key classroom management practices following DD1 training.

Commercial publications: Books and professional study guides. Commercial publications are literature that is available for public purchase. These include books and professional study guides. Commercial publications are intended to provide support to individual teachers and schools who wish to pursue independent learning and implementation in lieu of workshop-training and ongoing collaborations with DD. These publications can also be used in addition to formal support and ongoing collaboration with DD.

A large number of commercial books directly and indirectly support the implementation of Developmental Designs. Most of these books focus on the implementation of morning advisory and provide teachers with detailed plans for classroom use (e.g., *The Advisory Book*, *Face-to-Face Advisories*). Other books support the use of aspects of advisory, such as games and greetings, throughout the school day. One book, *Classroom Discipline: Guiding Adolescents to Responsible Independence*, focuses on classroom management specifically.

In addition to books, three professional development study guides are also included in DD's commercial publications. These professional study guides are designed to guide teacher teams or entire staff in book studies and implementation of DD. They include reading assignments, meeting outlines, roles and structures, detailed instructions for meeting leaders, small-group discussion formats, and ready-to-use classroom activities and suggestions.

Two of the three professional study guides were written to support *Classroom Discipline* and *The Advisory Book*. A third guide, *Developmental Designs Self-Coaching Guide*, is a book-length guide that supports teachers in reflecting on, accessing, and problem-solving their own implementation of DD1 practices (i.e. "self-coaching").

Electronic media. DD also employs electronic media to support the development of capabilities of practice. DD's electronic media include its website, blog, Facebook page, and two DVDs. Although these media are used to publically market and advertise DD's resources and

workshops, they also include content that supports understanding and implementation of the DD approach. DD's website material includes articles written by DD staff, principals, and teachers, as well as replicable classroom activities and trouble-shooting tips for most DD practices. DD's website also provides access to video exemplars of DD practices.

Key Categories of Procedural Guidance

Embedded within the formal media detailed above are the formal supports DD utilizes to transmit knowledge of its design and help develop the capabilities for practice it requires. DD attempts to define and develop classroom management capabilities by placing a heavy emphasis on the provision of procedural guidance. By procedural guidance, I mean categories of support that directly assist teachers' in-classroom use and enactment of the DD approach, particularly its ten core practices. A DD leader explained how the categories of procedural guidance identified below are at the heart of DD's approach to creating capabilities for classroom management practice:

Every middle school program in the country will say, "You should build a community in your classroom." Great, but what do I do? How do I do that? What's the language of that? What are some very specific practices? It's so specific that we actually give teachers the language. When you talk about modeling, the exact sentences you could use to be successful.

The types of procedural guidance include: (a) structures, strategies and routines; (b) teacher language scripts; (c) teacher planning and enactment resources; (d) supplementary (cognitive) guidance; and (e) teacher practice exemplars.

Structures, strategies and routines. Embedded within the DD design for classroom practice, particularly its ten core practices, are structures, strategies, and routines. These formal supports define and further elucidate each core practice, thereby guiding teacher enactment. Although not entirely exclusive, these supports can be thought of as differing along the lines of hierarchy and/or grain size. For instance, several DD practices are distilled into smaller structures that can be thought of as "block boxes" that often contain other strategies and/or routines. As well, while a strategy represents just one of several ways of reaching the end goal of a particular practice, routines are distinguished by specific steps and/or procedures.

Structures. Several DD practices are comprised of a number of smaller structures. A structure represents a necessary component of a core practice. The core practice of Advisory, for

instance, consists of four “mandatory” components -- greeting, sharing, activity, and daily news. DD refers to these structures as the “ritualized routines for building community.” Additionally, Empowering Language—a typology of teacher language—consists of five language structures (Directing, Reinforcing, Reminding, Redirecting, and Reflecting). Each of these language structures is used differently to guide and, when necessary, redirect student behavior.

Strategies. The Pathways of Self-Control are one of DD’s core practices that contain specific strategies to realize a specific end-goal (in this case, redirecting misbehavior). The Pathways to Self-Control include more than a dozen redirections (or corrective strategies) that teachers from which teachers can select to guide students’ back to self-control. These redirective strategies are not linear, sequential, or progressive. Instead, they are selected by the teacher according to the needs, attitudes, and motivations of individual students.

Routines. In addition to embedded strategies and structures, all DD core practices have been routinized, in one way or another. That is, each core practice has been distilled into a set of steps that guide teacher enactment of that practice.

Some of these routines consist of explicit and ordered steps. For instance, the DD1 Resource Book (2015) lists the “Steps of Modeling” classroom routines and behavior expectations (p. 73). These steps include: (1) ideas from students; (2) student/teacher demonstrations; (3) noticing and questioning; (4) students try; and (5) what ifs. Likewise, the DD1 Resource Book also provides a list of “Steps of a Quick Problem-Solving Conference” (i.e. a Collaborative Problem-Solving structure) (p. 133). These steps include: (1) describe the problem; (2) understanding; (3) plan for the future; and (4) closure (*Developmental Designs 1 Resource Book*, 2012, p. 133). Other DD core practices do not include the explicit use of the word “steps”; still, explicit procedures underlying these practices are provided. For instance, the procedures underlying Goal Setting include: set the stage, brainstorm, sorting and consolidating, consensus decision, and publication.

Teacher language scripts. In addition to structures, strategies, and routines, emphasis is also placed on teacher language as a critical formal support of practice. By teacher language, I mean the words, tone, and nonverbal gestures used by teachers with students. Teacher language is critical to every aspect of the DD design. In addition to being one of DD’s ten core practices (Empowering Language typology), it is also embedded within other DD practices, often in the form of codified teacher language scripts.

Teacher language scripts include both precise language for teachers to use verbatim, as well as examples of language for teachers to employ with some modification. Teacher language scripts include multi-paragraph and page length text, teacher-initiated question starters, and hypothetical, contextualized examples of teacher language. Teacher language scripts are identified in italics throughout in the DD1 Resource Book.

For instance, “Sample Teacher Language for Introduction of TAB and Other Redirections” (*Developmental Designs 1 Resource book*, 2012, pp. 123-124) includes precise language teachers can use verbatim to introduce (and seek endorsement for) each of the Pathways to Self-Control. Additionally, an adapted handout titled, “Sample Teacher Language for Introducing the Social Contract and Redirections” was included in the DD1 workshop materials.

Language scripts, in the form of teacher statements, questions, and contextualized examples, typically accompany structures, strategies, and routines embedded within DD’s core practices. For example, several question starters under Reminding Language (one of the 5 types of Empowering Teacher Language) include: *Tell me how you are going to...; Who remembers...?; and Remind me what you could say...* (*Developmental Designs 1 Resource Book*, 2012, p. 93). Such statements and questions are meant to be used by teachers during enactment and require no modification.

The teacher language script for Loss of Privilege (one of the redirections under the Pathways to Self-Control) includes language specific to a teaching and behavioral circumstance/scenario (i.e. taking away the privilege of working in groups during book discussions). The language script for Loss of Privilege includes:

We’re going to stop these book discussions now and work independently for the rest of the hour. Tomorrow we’ll review the guidelines and behaviors we set up for literature circles, and figure out how to get ourselves back on track (*Developmental Designs 1 Resource Book*, 2012, p. 119).

Unlike the first two types of teacher language scripts (introduction to The Pathways of Self-Control and question/statement starters), teachers are expected to adapt these scripts as needed.

Relationship between structures, strategies, routines and teacher language scripts.

Although structures, strategies and routines and teacher language scripts are distinct formal supports for guiding the understanding and enactment of DD’s core practices, they work

interdependently. This is implied by the examples included above; however, DD leaders also made this relationship between these categories of support explicit in their reports.

For example, referencing the steps (routines) and teacher language scripts outlined in the Developmental Designs 1 Resource Book (2012) for “Quick-Conferencing”, one DD leader explained how these two categories of procedural guidance worked interdependently:

There is a few pages of the philosophy, but what comes right after a page of “what is this about” is a *four-step process*, a little picture on the left and some *specific language to use* on the right. So, it’s very specific and usable. I tell teachers “copy this and take it to a quick conference and you’ll get the hang of it” (emphasis added).

Importantly, this quote also points to the idea that the Developmental Designs 1 Resource Book was designed to support teachers’ enactment of DD practices following workshop training.

Referencing the Developmental Designs 1 Resource Book (2012), another DD leader described the interdependencies between the language scripts supporting Empowering Language, as well as the language scripts and routines supporting Modeling and Practicing:

We tried to make it more than just the philosophy of how to talk to kids, but the actual, “What do I really say to kids?” and that’s what I think we do best as an organization. We take the big picture of something like, “Well, you need to talk to kids when problems arise” but teachers want to know, “Well, what do I say?” Or, “You need to model your expectations.” Teachers want to know “Well, how do I model?” So, in the resource book, if you go to the section on modeling, it’s a *six-step process*. There’s a little picture on the left. And on the right, is *the exact language*. It’s a very step-by-step practical guide that teachers can use in the classroom (original emphasis).

As the above examples point to, coupling teacher understanding of the purpose(s) of, and research supporting, specific DD practices, along with pairing this understanding with specific teacher moves (routines/steps) and language scripts, is key to DD’s approach to developing capabilities for DD practice.

Teacher planning and enactment resources. DD also attempts to guide teachers’ enactment of DD practices through providing ready-to-use classroom resources. Consumable resources include reproducible forms and detailed plans for advisory that teachers can use immediately in their classrooms. Many of these resources either enable, reduce, or eliminate teacher planning. For example, a DD leader who helped write several DD resource books

explains how the inclusion of these resources, in order to reduce teacher planning with respect to morning advisory, was intentional:

We tried to make the resource books very user friendly. There's a lot of pages of things teachers can use. There are a lot of real specific ideas, less philosophy and more practicality in the resource books. The back of the DD1 book, there are piles of things to do during advisory. There's probably 20 games, there's different types of activities and shares. So very specific, practical things teachers will be able to use.

Other consumable resources act as a scaffold for teacher planning and enactment. Examples of reproducible forms include: teacher planning sheets for introducing students to a routine and planning an activity with the Loop; a Tab Out student reflection form; and forms students use to establish (and reflect on) his/her own individual goals and declarations. Additionally, the DD1 Resource Book (and website) includes dozens of daily plans to each of the four components of advisory. Teachers can use these in addition to or in place of planning for advisory on their own (or releasing advisory planning to students).

Supplementary (cognitive) guidance. The DD1 Resource Book also attempts to develop teachers' capabilities for classroom management by providing guidance aimed at improving teachers' practical understanding. This supplementary, cognitive guidance is in the form of question and answer sections (Q/A) and "Plan for Success" implementation tips. Q/A sections are used to address typical/anticipated implementation issues and challenges. For example, the questions included in the Q/A section for Modeling and Practicing were:

How long does it take, and how many repetitions, to model a procedure? What if my students think it is childish to model and practice? What if many of them will not follow the procedure? What if, for example, I've modeled the signal for silence and students keep talking? (*Developmental Designs 1 Resource Book*, 2012, pp. 76-77).

Naturally, not every typical or anticipated implementation issue and challenge will be able to be addressed during workshop training. As such, Q/A sections allow for future reference as implementation issues arise. Similarly, Plan for Success boxes for most DD practices are used to bring teachers' attention to additional information, areas of caution and to offer encouragement. For instance, the Plan for Success boxes included for Modeling and Practicing includes specific "do's and don'ts" for making a signal for silence work as intended as well as suggested times of the year to remodel routines.

Teacher practice exemplars. Video exemplars are video clips of DD-trained teachers enacting core practices in their classrooms. Access to these exemplars is granted to contracted schools and teachers receiving e-coaching services. Two DVDs—“Modeling and Practicing Classroom Routines: DVD” and “Circle of Power and Respect Advisory Meeting: DVD”—include video exemplars of related DD practices as well as downloadable viewing guides. Similar to professional study guides, DVD viewing guides are designed to support the use of DVDs as tools for professional development.

DD’s Social Supports of Practice

DD has designed two mediums for transmitting the DD design, for building capabilities for practice, and for improving classroom- and school-level implementation and sustainability. One medium consists of workshops. Another consists of coaching (and consultation).³⁹ These two mediums of social interaction and exchange are critical to developing teachers’ classroom management capabilities. In fact, DD leaders consider DD1 weeklong training and expert coaching DD’s two linchpin resources.

Workshop Training

There are three types of DD workshops: introductory, in-depth, and follow-up.⁴⁰ Introductory workshops are designed to give participants a high-level overview of the DD approach. In-depth workshops are designed to give teachers a deeper understanding of DD, particularly of its ten core practices. Follow-up workshops assist with extending, as well as troubleshooting, implementation following DD1 training.

³⁹ Although DD leaders used the terms “coaching” and “consultation” somewhat interchangeably, they have important distinctions. DD coaching refers to work with teachers focused on honing their understanding and use of DD practices. Consultation, on the other hand, is an “umbrella term” used to describe interactions between DD staff and schools that have more of a school-wide focus (e.g., school-wide DD implementation plans, data analysis). Furthermore, whereas DD coaching is focused on individual teachers and the observation of teaching practice, consultation refers to work with groups of teachers (PLCs, grade-level and content-area), coaches, school leadership teams and principals.

⁴⁰ DD’s two introductory workshops—Getting Started with Developmental Designs Practices and Open the Circle—are intended to introduce school staff to the DD approach prior to contracting for the DD1 and DD2 weeklong trainings and ongoing coaching support(s). The former introduces school staff to DD’s underpinnings and key practices for integrating SEL with academics. The latter is intended to introduce school staff to a single DD structure or practice known as advisory, or Circle of Power and Respect (CPR). Advisory (or CPR) is a set of relationship, community and SEL skill building structures and activities used to replace what is traditionally known in schools as morning homeroom. Both of these introductory workshops can act as stand-alone training in the event that weeklong training and ongoing support is not financially feasible.

DD1 and DD2 are multi-day workshops conducted at school-sites or at predetermined locations throughout the year. Both DD1 and DD2 are designed for entire school staff or teams of teachers (grade-level, leadership). DD1 and DD2 workshops are ideally taken over the course of two subsequent summers and represent comprehensive training in the DD approach.

Although DD1 and DD2 share some content in common, these workshops are purposed with covering different aspects of the DD approach. DD1 primarily covers advisory (CPR) and DD's approach to classroom management, while DD2 primarily covers integrating DD within academic content. The expressed goals of DD1 include: building a supportive classroom community; leveraging students' developmental strengths; and teaching students how to manage their own behavior. The expressed goals of DD2 include: pacing and timing classes to boost students' focus and retention; bridging student experiences and past lessons to new content; and integrating choice and diverse learning modalities into your lessons.

On condition of completing DD1 workshop training, DD offers four follow-up workshops. These workshops are designed to extend learning and trouble-shoot implementation issues related to DD1 practices.⁴¹ The titles of these workshops are:

1. Establishing and Maintaining Effective Routines;
2. Getting the Most from Your Advisory;
3. Responding to Rule Breaking; and
4. Reviving Your Empowering Language.

Follow-up workshop are designed to be full-day workshops but can be customized to meet schools' and teachers' specific needs and time constraints.

Experiential learning: Key workshop training modalities. In addition to social interaction, all DD workshops leverage a common set of training modalities. By modalities, I mean the specific designs for professional learning employed by workshop designers and facilitators to help participants gain an understanding of and facility with the DD approach. These training modalities emphasize social-constructivist approaches to learning in a community. The training modalities employed in workshops include: (a) immersion; (b) participant enactment; (c) application; (d) demonstration and observation; (e) collective sense-making structures; and (f) didactic instruction.

⁴¹ No follow-up workshops related to DD2 workshop-training content had been developed.

Immersion. A key design feature of workshops is having teachers *experience* DD by embedding DD philosophy, practices, and structures within the workshop itself. Below, a DD leader describes how this design feature relates to the DD1 workshop, specifically:

The entire week is structured that all of the material that we're presenting, are presented through the same structures we want them to go back and use with their students. We're using a lot of the same structures we would ask the teachers to use... We want them to experience, themselves, what happens in a Developmental Designs' classroom. The way that the workshops are taught is in the same way we would want you to teach in your classroom.

DD leaders, such as the one quoted above, emphasized that immersion was a key design feature of all DD workshops and was at the heart of their approach to developing initial DD capabilities. Another DD leader described how immersing teachers in DD during training was important to engendering teacher understanding and buy-in to the approach:

For them to believe that they need to take time to do the things we're talking about, to have fun, to build relationships to make sure that students are feeling competence, and they get their need for autonomy met... if they don't understand and experience that, teachers will not be engaged in building that sort of culture.

All DD leaders reported that it was immersive learning design of DD's workshops that made them such a powerful and enjoyable experience for teachers. Examples of immersion learning during DD1 training included: having participants' co-construct workshop goals (Day 1 of the workshop); and developing, gaining consensus around, and ratifying a social contract (Day 1-2) to guide workshop participant behavior. Additionally, each day, participants partook in all four components of Advisory and used The Loop to plan for and reflect on most workshop activities. Furthermore, the facilitator regularly used a signal for silence ("Give Me Five") to gather participants' attention. She also led the group in co-constructing a routine for taking breaks prior to the workshops first scheduled break.

Participant enactment. Participant enactment closely resembles immersion learning but differs in terms of the role teachers' play. Immersion learning is a result of workshop design, is largely initiated by workshop facilitators, and requires teachers to engage with DD practices and structures much like students would. During enactments, on the other hand, participants engaged with DD structures and practices much as they would as DD-trained teachers. Examples of

enactments included working in groups to plan and lead a component of advisory (game, share, and/or activity). As well, after leading their game, activity, or share, groups lead participants through The Looping process. Participant enactments also included planning to teach a classroom routine of their choosing using the planning sheet, "Introducing Students to a Routine." These enactments paralleled exactly what DD teachers would need to know and be able to do in their own classrooms.

Application. Application included case studies, scenarios, or other activities that asked participants to apply their knowledge of DD gained as a result of workshop- training. For instance, after spending several days learning about DD's classroom management approach, participants were assigned case studies that included descriptions of student (mis)behavior and teacher responses. They were asked to provide answers to the following four questions: (1) What is the issue/problem? (2) How did the teacher respond to the student? (3) What new habit or skill did the teacher need to teach the student? (4) What DD strategy or structure would you have used to respond to/redirect the student? Another activity required participants to take scenarios of student misbehaviors written on index cards and match them to specific DD redirections. Another activity required groups to develop scenarios of student misbehavior that might call for the use of specific redirections and language structures (directing, reinforcing, reminding, redirecting and reflecting).

Demonstration and observation. Demonstrations, such as facilitator modeling and participant role-playing, were used with several DD practices. For instance, the workshop facilitator had a participant help her role-play how to conduct a quick problem-solving conference. The facilitator then had partners alternate roles as student and teacher to do the same. As she transitioned participants into work groups, the facilitator demonstrated "moving with a purpose." In addition to facilitator demonstrations, teachers watched several video exemplars of authentic, DD-trained teacher enactments. These videos showed participants how to correctly use several DD practices (e.g., signal for silence, advisory games, greetings, shares and activities, introduce redirections, teacher modeling, several redirections).

Collective sense-making structures. Emphasis was placed on having participants co-construct their learning and understanding through various collaboration and dialogic structures. Collaboration and dialogue were often combined and used to have participants share information, expertise and musings.

Workshop activities emphasized collaborations between group participants through the use of various grouping structures. These grouping structures ranged from simple “turn and talks” (sharing with the participant to one’s right or left) to “clock partners” and multi-group pairings. Clock partners involved twelve unique partner pairings corresponding to the twelve-hour hands (1-12). A facilitator directive such as “Now, get with your 7:00 partner,” cued participants to whom it was they would be working with for a particular activity. Multi-group pairings involved blending groups together to share their expertise on a topic. For instance, after each group was assigned reading from the DD1 resource book on one of the five types of Empowering Language, groups were rearranged so that everyone could learn about the other four language types from other groups’ members.

Partner and group activities included both structured and semi-structured dialogue. Structured dialogue was embedded within most partner and group workshop activities. For instance, several workshop activities structured dialogue through predetermined questions and/or group work products (e.g., analyzing case studies and scenarios; planning a component of advisory; planning for teaching a routine).

Semi-structured dialogue, on the other hand, often followed demonstration, application, participant enactment, and whole-group instruction activities. Semi-structured dialogue was also more open-ended and targeted toward the entire group of participants. Following each workshop activity, The Loop was used to guide participants’ reflection. For instance, following advisory, the facilitator would pose questions such as: What skills does this game teach children? How can we scaffold this share for shyer students? What potential issues do you see our kids having with this activity? Importantly, when questions such as anticipated implementation concerns were directed toward the workshop facilitator, she would routinely re-voice the question to the entire group, giving participants the opportunity to offer their insights and expertise before answering herself.

Didactic instruction. This instruction included formal presentations given by the workshop facilitator as well as assigned, independent reading. Facilitator presentations utilized PowerPoint slides. These slides included direct excerpts, summarized text, and page numbers from the DD1 Resource Book. Presentations were used to provide participants with an in-depth overview of DD practices and structures as well as to familiarize them with the contents of the DD1 Resource Book itself. Although the workshop privileged more experiential modalities

described below, whole-group instruction occurred throughout the duration of the workshop. Specifically, the other modalities described above were often preceded or succeeded by whole-group instruction.

Coaching

Weeklong workshops, particularly DD1, are necessary yet insufficient to developing teachers' capabilities to implement the DD approach. A DD leader explained how the breadth of content contained in DD1 (and DD2) workshops necessitates that they be reinforced with ongoing coaching support:

It's so unreal to expect that they're going to take a week-long workshop that has as much depth to it as DD does and go back and be able to implement like that. What a coach can do is come in, observe, acknowledge teachers so they can start making those changes throughout the day. It's supporting them making the changes.

Although DD1 (and DD2) workshops are considered "in-depth", weeklong workshops, they still represent a high-level overview and introduction to the DD approach. Another DD leader plainly stated: "I think it's an overwhelming process to take the workshop, go back, and think you're going to implement everything. You're not."

There are three DD coaching models: expert, peer and self-guided. The two primary coaching models used to support DD implementation are expert and peer. A more emergent option, based on recently published *Self-Coaching Guide*, guides teachers in evaluating and improving their own practice.

Expert coaching. Expert coaching is coaching provided directly by DD certified coaches or consultants. Expert coaching can take the form of either on-site coaching (face-to-face) or e-coaching (video-based).

On-site coaching. On-site coaching consists of a DD trained/certified consultant/coach providing in-classroom observations of and feedback on individual teachers' use of DD practices. A DD leader summarized onsite coaching as: "We go in classrooms, work with teachers individually, observe, give them feedback on how things are going and provide next steps."

DD leaders reported that expert coaching worked best when focused on a small group of highly committed DD teachers in order to improve their fidelity in preparation to be peer coaches. They referred to this group as a school's "core team." However, DD leaders described

the selection of teachers they work with as very fluid and largely driven by the preferences and constraints of schools, principals, and teachers.

E-coaching. E-coaching was described by DD leaders as a relatively new, video-based coaching option. It allows DD expert coaches to observe and provide feedback on video-taped teacher enactments without the costs incurred by travel. Schools (or teachers) initiate e-coaching services by purchasing any number of e-coaching modules. A single module consists of three coaching cycles—each cycle beginning with the uploading of teacher video clip and ending with coaching feedback—focused on a DD1 practice of a teacher’s choosing. Skype sessions and email exchanges also occur as part of e-coaching. Additionally, teachers receiving e-coaching gain access to an online resource library that includes video exemplars of DD practices.

Peer coaching. Peer coaching refers to the direct training of internal coaches. Internal coaches are district-level and school-level DD-trained personnel who, after demonstrating proficiency in all ten DD practices, take a peer coaching workshop to learn adult learning facilitation skills and coaching techniques. One DD leader described how commitment to the DD approach, proficient knowledge and use of DD practices, and coaching-specific skills were important in identifying (and training) potential peer coaches:

We say, “If you want to develop coaches, we can develop coaches.” I’ve coached you, Amina, three or four times. I see that you’re really passionate about your learning and you’re taking all the steps to increase your skills in Developmental Designs. We first go in and coach them to proficiency and then we teach them coaching skills. How do you coach other people? They become the peer coaches within their schools or districts.

Furthermore, DD leaders described the ideal scenario being one in which a “core team” of teachers (rather than individuals) worked with DD coaches/consultants to improve their fidelity of implementation followed by training as peer coaches. Core team members’ classrooms would serve as model classrooms for the observation of high-fidelity DD1 practice in a school (or district). Core teams, peer coaches, and the cultivation of model classrooms help to permanently institutionalize and sustain DD in schools and districts over time.

Self-coaching. The *Self-Coaching Guide* was originally designed to guide teachers in improving their capabilities for practice independently; that is, absent peer or expert DD coaching supports. The six DD1 practices contained in the guide include: Advisory, Goal Setting, Social Contract, Modeling and Practicing, Empowering Teacher Language, and

Pathways to Self-control. In addition to the aforementioned DD1 practices, the *Self-Coaching Guide* also includes a chapter on teacher mindsets. As described by one DD leader: “The *Self-Coaching Guide* is already at the mastery level...and so if you were using the *Self-Coaching Guide*, you could essentially coach yourself to proficiency.”

The *Self-Coaching Guide* is divided by each of the six DD1 practices it targets. Each practice is further subdivided into three sections: guided reflection, barriers and strategies. Below, a DD leader describes the three-part structure of the *Self-Coaching Guide*:

There are three parts. The first part is the self-reflection. You write a couple of pages of reflection and then what you consider barriers. “So what’s getting in my way?” We’ve been in schools long enough. We know the common barriers are things like relationships, teacher preparation, endorsement, and engagement. So, I pick one of the barriers from my reflection. And then the next section is on strategies...I would go to the strategy section and...it gives you ideas about how to overcome the barrier.

As this quote illustrates, self-coaching involves a teacher’s use of the *Self-Coaching Guide* to access, guide, and trouble-shoot issues related to the implementation of six DD1 practices. For example, another DD leader described how the guide might be used to overcome students’ lack of participation in the sharing component of advisory, a common advisory implementation challenge:

Let’s say for CPR, the guide describes what CPR should contain for it to be a good successful, fidelity CPR. So teachers do some reflecting and then there is a section that talks about possible reasons for—whatever, let’s say the kids don’t share. There is a section that follows the reflection that says, “Okay, these might be some of the barriers if your students aren’t sharing during the sharing component.” Then, after that, there’s a section on strategies that you can put into place and things that you can do to try and improve that part of your practice.

Emergent blending between coaching models. Each of these coaching models—particularly expert and peer—have distinct advantages and disadvantages with respect to developing teachers’ capabilities for practice (to be discussed in the subsequent chapter). Expert, peer, and self-coaching are often used in tandem with one another. For instance, expert DD coaching is embedded within the peer coaching model and, increasingly, the self-guided coaching model, as well. As part of the peer coaching model, teachers are first coached to

fidelity in all ten core DD practices by a DD expert coach prior to receiving training in peer coaching. Additionally, DD is currently experimenting with ways to more formally and explicitly embed the *Self-Coaching Guide* within the expert and peer models as an implementation fidelity template.

Tight and Loose Integration Among DD's Formal and Social Supports of Practice

The strongest integration between DD's formal and social supports of practice was between the following clusters: (a) workshop training and procedural guidance; (b) the goals, focus, and benefits associated with both DD expert-coaching and procedural guidance; and (c) e-coaching and procedural guidance. The weakest integration was between its (a) on-site coaching model (social) and procedural guidance (formal) and (b) the ways in which DD leveraged different training modalities (social) in support of its the guidance (formal) provided for its approach to reactive discipline.

Tight Integration

As previously stated, the strongest integration between DD's formal and social supports of practice were in three areas: one, between workshop training and procedural guidance; two, the goals, focus, and benefits associated with both DD expert-coaching and procedural guidance; and three, e-coaching and procedural guidance. DD1 workshop training and DD coaching serve complimentary purposes with respect to capability development. DD workshops introduce teachers to DD's approach. This includes DD's philosophy, goals, and approach to classroom management. Participating in workshop training also allows teachers to experience and practice using the formal supports of practice previously described. DD coaching, on the other hand, is viewed as critical to high-fidelity use of core practices in classroom settings, as well as long-term sustainability of the approach.⁴²

Workshop training (social) and procedural guidance (formal). The ways in which DD's workshop training and procedural guidance were integrated have been documented above vis-à-vis the description of training modalities embedded in workshop designs to teach and

⁴² Initial and ongoing support for developing capabilities is made more feasible by contracting with DD, rather than, for instance, sending individual teachers or small teams. Schools, who commit to training 30 or more staff, contract for a package of supports. These include: a DD1 or DD2 weeklong training, DD1 or DD2 Resource Book and for each participant and two implementation support days (e.g., coaching or follow-up workshop or combination). All workshops and coaching are provided by DD certified facilitators and coaches who have been formally trained in DD and coaching skills over the span of several years beginning as classroom teachers.

immerse participants in the DD approach (i.e. immersion, participant enactment, application, demonstration and observation, collective sense-making structures and didactic instruction). These experiential learning modalities were used to teach participants DD's design for practice (e.g., its ten core practices) and, by extension and to varying degrees, key categories of procedural guidance (e.g., structures, strategies, routines) for supporting these practices.

Below, I describe other ways in which workshop training (i.e. DD1, DD2, and follow-up workshops) and procedural guidance were integrated by way of: (a) standardization in design and alignment with resource book content (and the procedural guidance contained within them); (b) the use of post-DD1 workshops to reflect on, problem-solve around, and further extend uses of DD1; and (c) tight integration between the goals, focus, and benefits of coaching (generally) and DD's e-coaching model, specifically, and procedural guidance.

DD1 workshop training: Leveraging standardization in design and (resource book) content.⁴³ There is a high degree of integration between DD workshops and the procedural guidance included in accompanying workshop resource books. DD workshops are largely standardized in both design and content. DD leaders reported that the design of all DD workshops was based on social learning and interaction and adult learning theory. This design was used in order to both immerse participants in the DD approach, as well as to teach specific aspects of DD. Further, workshop content closely aligns to the content and material included in accompanying resource books, including procedural guidance contained within them. As one DD leader reported: "Workshops follow the resource manuals pretty closely, but we do spend more time on some things than others." Using the DD1 workshop as an example, another DD leader reported: "DD1 is standardized across the board. All the facilitators teach from the same outline. We go over that outline and do some professional development every spring."

DD2 and follow-up workshops: Reflection, problem-solving and extending DD1. The integration between post-DD1 workshops (i.e. DD2 and four follow-up workshops) and procedural guidance was in the form of guiding teachers' reflection, supporting problem-solving and extending their use of the DD approach. These workshops also assist teachers in extending implementation focus and fidelity from advisory to throughout the school day.

⁴³ Variation in workshop training naturally results from differences in facilitator experiences, stories/examples they use as illustrations and the questions and concerns posed by workshop participants.

The workshops that follow DD1 share the same design and content standardization features as DD1. Follow-up workshops differ from the DD1 workshop in that they are designed, entirely or in part, to support post-DD1 classroom implementation. Follow-up workshops were referred to as “mini DD2s” by one DD leader due to having the common focus of providing some time to review, reflection, and problem-solving around DD1 implementation.

Both DD2 and follow-up workshops (and resource books) support the development of classroom management practice. A DD leader describes how DD2, specifically, provides some extensions of DD’s approach to classroom management:

We add some resources—some practices here and there—that will provide additional support in the classroom such as “stop and modeling,” “conspiracy of caring” and, “the check ins.” So, there’s a little bit of discipline in Developmental Designs 2. But Developmental Designs 2 is primarily about academic engagement.

Although DD leaders describe DD2 as primarily about integrating DD with academic content, about half of the DD2 resource book is a review (and extension) of DD1 classroom management material.

DD leaders noted the necessity of DD2 (and follow-up workshops) to develop teachers’ capabilities for DD classroom management practice. DD leaders emphasized that the DD1 workshop, in particular, covered a lot of material, material that was often overwhelming for teachers to remember yet alone implement with just workshop training. Below, a DD leader describes how the amount of content covered in DD1 made ongoing support, including follow-up workshops, necessary:

There’s so much that they take out of the DD1 workshop. Then they go back to school and they have all their other demands. They still want to implement DD but there are certain places where it slips or where they forget what they’re doing or they’re not as tight as they should be on certain things. Then they come to the follow-up workshops... They start looking... and we start questioning, “Well, what are some of the things that you’ve done to set all of these pieces up?” and the light bulb goes off and says, “Oops, I didn’t do that. I missed some of those pieces. I didn’t stay true to that, I didn’t stay firm with that.” I think it’s a really strong reflective piece to get those practices in line.

DD leaders, such as the one above, identified teacher reflection—whether included as part of a post-DD1 workshop or explicitly embedded in coaching supports (e.g., e-coaching modules and

Self-coaching Guide)—as an integral component in developing teachers’ ongoing capabilities for DD practice.

Post-DD1 workshops also attempted to extend teacher use of DD by addressing a common implementation problem: the tendency of many DD-trained teachers to focus implementation efforts on advisory rather than viewing advisory as part of the DD approach. One DD leader described how many teachers tended to implement advisory immediately following DD1, but often find implementing DD practices throughout the school day more difficult:

Coming out of a 30 hour workshop, the idea is that there’s a lot covered. And the one thing I usually take back is usually advisory and they go back and implement advisory. But the idea is how do you put language in all day long? How do you use the loop all day long? How do you utilize Pathways all day long?...It’s the application in the rest of the day beyond the advisory period... That’s where they go “Ops, I got the advisory piece down, but man, I don’t know what to do now with this...” I think that maybe sometimes you know, they carry the one piece back. And then teachers forget what to do otherwise.

One DD leader described how follow-up workshops, particularly “Establishing and Maintaining Effective Routines” and “Responding to Rule Breaking,” help teachers implement DD’s approach to classroom management:

We teach the practices that are in the follow-up workshop through doing the practices and reflecting on what’s happening in the classroom. So, the “routines” and the “rule breaking” especially those two are huge in taking a reflective look at your practice and what’s happening and where your trouble spots are. And then looking at DD practices and how can you increase your fidelity of implementation to support those areas that you might need more work.

DD leaders reported that without post-DD1 workshops (and coaching), DD practice was often concentrated within advisory with select DD practices being implemented throughout the school day.

Coaching (social) and procedural guidance (formal). Tight integration between DD coaching and procedural guidance existed in terms of the reported goals, focus and benefits of DD coaching and the design of its e-coaching model.

General goals (and perceived benefits) of DD coaching in relationship to procedural guidance. DD leaders discussed the purposes and benefits of coaching in terms of: (a) preventing regression to past practice; (b) increasing fidelity throughout the school day; and (c) developing proficiency and providing long-term sustainability of the approach.

Preventing regression to past practice. As described previously, DD's classroom management approach represents a drastic change in practice for many teachers. A DD leader describes how, absent coaching, many teachers are unlikely to persist in making these changes:

If there's no one else in the building that can provide support for them and guide them, they're left on their own and what often happens is they just start to go back to the ways they used to teach.

DD leaders reported that coaching helps provide the emotional and practical support necessary to overcome the challenges and strains inherent in implementing any new program or approach.

Increasing fidelity of implementation of core practices throughout the school day. Another benefit of coaching is that it helps teachers improve fidelity of implementation, rather than selectively implementing DD practices and structures. Although all sources of evidence suggest that DD is a comprehensive approach to organizing and managing classrooms, DD leaders report that teachers (and schools) more easily adopt certain DD practices and structures than others.

One of the practices teachers and schools adopt immediately following workshop-training is advisory. This is in part because advisory is often a school and/or district mandate. Another practice is TAB Out (or Take a Break out of the classroom), one of the redirections under the Pathways to Self-control. TAB Out is usually quickly adopted by schools as a quasi-mandate used in place of sending students to the office, thus reducing office referrals.

Below, a DD leader describes why workshop-training alone, regardless of quality, is insufficient to ensure teacher fidelity of implementation of DD's ten core practices:

The week that they're in the workshop is transformational for most teachers. They get it when they're there. I think they get it when they leave. But when reality hits and they're back in school and the dyke opens up and everything else is poured in their lap, they find the few little life jackets they can grab onto. One of them is advisory so they just focus on doing advisory really well and forget that all of the things that they're building needs to happen in every single one of their classes.

Importantly, advisory is viewed as a microcosm of all DD practices and a time during which teachers can experiment with DD practices and structures in preparation for implementing them throughout their day. However, this doesn't happen easily or automatically. DD coaching helps teachers make this transition.

Developing proficiency. Closely related to increasing fidelity of implementation outside of advisory is developing teachers' proficient use of practices. DD leaders, such as this one below, described this as another benefit of coaching:

The idea that training alone is going to help me gain the skills is a fallacy. I can have PD and I can try it out, but if I have an expert, someone who's done this, who's had success with it, as a coach, then I'm able to gain proficiency faster. I'm being reinforced so I'm not giving up on trying something out.

Another DD leader described the importance of coaching to proficient use of practices using Take a Break, another practice that is widely adopted by teachers following workshop-training, as an example:

We hear all the time, "Take a break doesn't work." If you had a coach who was able to come into your classroom, demonstrate how you would teach it to the kids, watch me as I had the opportunity to discipline kids and help me bridge some gaps with: "I heard some tone in there that may be rubbing your kids the wrong way; Have you thought about trying it this way?"; "Sharon doesn't seem to really care about taking a break...How do you help Sharon?"

DD coaching can help teachers implement practices with more proficiency and, similar to the selective implementation of DD practices and structures such as advisory, help teachers understand how to implement the full complement of redirections (outside of Take a Break).

Long-term sustainability. In addition to preventing regression to past practice, increasing fidelity throughout the school day and increasing teachers' proficient use of DD practices, coaching is also essential to sustaining the approach in schools over the long-term.

Below, a DD leader describes how using external, DD coaches to create internal, school-level DD coaches is critical:

What we want is the schools to be self-sufficient, which seems silly because we make money out of them needing us, but we really do want them to be self-sufficient. The goal is that, if you have multiple teachers in the building trained, to find two or three teachers

who are really invested and really willing to work to fidelity and really willing to step up in the building to be a resource for others.

Another DD leader describes how issues of sustainability make DD coaching, rather than follow-up workshop-training, an optimal social support of practice:

We actually would prefer that schools act on the coaching piece instead of more training. It would be more substantial, in the long run, of sustaining the practices in their schools so that they can build up expertise in their schools. It would be most valuable and we would prefer to sell that.

Another DD leader describes how peer coaching is integral to high-fidelity implementation of DD practices, building school-wide capacity, and ensuring sustainability of the DD approach in general:

The whole idea is that we want to coach teachers to fidelity. But then we want to coach schools to be self-sufficient. So we do the coaching in classrooms to get teachers to fidelity. And then we also work within the schools to get those people ready to coach their peers, so they can then be the DD experts in the school.

Integration between e-coaching model and procedural guidance. There is tight integration between categories of procedural guidance and DD's e-coaching model. Specifically, DD e-coaches leverage guidance contained within the Self-Coaching Guide for Advisory, Goal Setting, Social Contract, Modeling and Practicing, Empowering Teaching Language, and Pathways to Self-Control.

Teachers are given up to six opportunities (or cycles or modules)—each including feedback provided by a DD coach—to show proficiency in the strategies, steps, routines, and language scripts contained within one of the core practices mentioned above. A coaching cycle begins when a teacher uploads a video clip of his/her teaching practice. A coaching cycle ends when a DD coach tags and embeds comments, questions and next steps relative to the explicit performance expectations relative to that practice, and sends these back to the teacher for review. One DD leader gave an example:

So you want to improve your modeling and we say one module will help you get there. But it's hard to ever say that as a fact because some teachers could take six back and forth modules to get every piece correct. And others get it right away: "Oh, you got modeling.

You got all the steps; that's all the steps right there. That's the language. You got it nailed."

The Self-Coaching Guide provides a common metric to inform teacher practice and DD e-coaches' assessment of teachers' video-based enactments of DD-practices.

Loose Integration

Integration between DD's formal and social supports of practice were primarily weaker in two areas: one, between its on-site, expert coaching model (social) and procedural guidance (formal); and two, the ways in which DD leveraged different training modalities (social) in support of its the guidance (formal) provided for its approach to reactive discipline.

On-site expert coaching model (social) and procedural guidance (formal). This chapter and the research question it answers deals principally with the *design* of DD's social and formal supports of practice. However, analysis of sources of evidence (namely program documentation and teacher and leader interviews) point to DD expert coaching as drifting from its original design and intent. This was evidenced by both teacher perceptions of DD expert coaching and well as interviews with DD leaders regarding the ways the implementation of this support has changed over time (both of which are discussed in the following two results chapters). In sum, on-site DD expert coaching as a practice was generally described as being too infrequent and unfocused to meet its stated design goals (e.g., preventing regression to past practice; increasing fidelity throughout the school day; developing proficiency and providing long-term sustainability of the approach).

Reactive discipline: The differential use of training modalities (social) and procedural guidance (formal). DD1 workshop facilitators differentially leveraged training modalities when training participants to use proactive and reactive classroom management practices. This was observed during participation in a DD1 workshop training and substantiated in interviews with DD1 leaders.

While highly experiential and authentic learning modalities such as immersion learning and participant enactment were used with proactive strategies and structures (i.e. advisory, goal setting, social contract, modeling and practicing, etc.), reactive strategies (redirections under the Pathways to Self-Control) were learned through less experiential modalities. Below, a DD leader contrasted the ways in which proactive and reactive management practices tended to be embedded in DD1 workshop training:

So some of the reactive strategies are not in place there in that way. We model what it looks like, for instance, to take a break. So, I become the teacher, they become the kid. Or, I model for them how I introduce take a break to my students. We have some really in-depth conversations when learning about those. We go through that process and we talk about what might be some of the pitfalls. But I don't, during the course of the workshop, tell someone who's talking to their neighbor to take a break. Whereas, I do ask them to write goals, I do ask them to create a social contract together, I do ask them to participate in advisory every day and so on.

The reliance on demonstration, discussion, and didactic instruction to teach reactive management strategies likely influenced how teachers understood this side of DD's approach to classroom management.

Discussion

All sources of evidence (program documentation, DD leader interviews, and participant-observation of the DD1 workshop-training) support that DD's primary, in-principle supports of practice created to develop teachers' DD capabilities include: (a) procedural guidance (as embedded in its ten core practices and program literature, principally the DD1 Resource Book); (b) workshop training privileging specific experiential learning modalities; and (c) coaching. Furthermore, DD workshops utilize training modalities that privilege social interaction and experiential learning to develop teachers' acquisition of DD's foundational knowledge and procedural skill capabilities. Less explicit focus was on developing teachers' dispositional traits (mindsets). Importantly, with respect to DD's approach to classroom management, less experiential learning modalities were employed to teach (and learn) reactive/corrective discipline (The Pathways of Self-Control). Lastly, integration between DD's formal and social supports of practice were strong in some areas and weak in others.

DD's formal and social supports of practice most directly focus on the development of foundational knowledge and procedural knowledge/practical skill capabilities. The explicit focus on the development of dispositional capabilities (teacher mindsets) was not found. For instance, with respect to DD's formal supports of practice and the development of classroom management capabilities, various types of procedural guidance (e.g., prescribed strategies, structures and routines; teacher language structures and scripts) attempt to help routinize teacher behavior and language (in particular). DD leaders mentioned that this was an intentional design feature on the

part of resource book authors. However, the DD1 workshop (and resource book) did not focus explicitly or directly on developing teachers' dispositional capabilities. Additionally, the DD1 Resource Book does not directly or explicitly include content on teacher mindsets (dispositional capabilities). Instead, discussion of teacher mindsets is included in the DD2 Resource Book (and in the second chapter of the *Self-Coaching Guide*).

Furthermore, the DD1 workshop privileged both a focus on proactive/preventative discipline practices and the use of less experiential learning modalities when teaching reactive/corrective discipline strategies. This may have been due to the difficulty of approximating classroom conditions in workshop settings with respect to preventative and proactive discipline (in comparison to corrective or reactive discipline). Reactive strategies (i.e. redirections included in the Pathways to Self-control used to redirect misbehavior) did not lend themselves to being naturally embedded within the workshop itself. This is likely because conditions necessitating the use of reactive management strategies—misbehavior followed by redirection/corrective action—are difficult to approximate in an adult learning environments. The use of less experiential learning modalities with respect to reactive/corrective discipline (The Pathways of Self-control) likely has implications for how teachers understand and use these strategies.

The degree of integration between DD's formal and social supports varied. There is a high degree of integration between the content covered in resource books (i.e. various formal supports for practice) and the content and materials utilized in workshops. There is also a high degree of integration between e-coaching and the identified categories of procedural guidance. However, there was weak integration between on-site, expert DD coaching, and the identified categories of procedural guidance.

While e-coaching was aligned to procedural guidance (as leveraged and contained within the Self-Coaching Guide), DD leaders and teachers generally reported that on-site (i.e. expert DD coaching) tended to be too infrequent and/or lack focus. As previously noted, DD leaders view coaching following workshop-training as absolutely critical to developing teachers' capabilities for practice, and they have developed an array of workshops (introductory, in-depth and follow-up), coaching models (i.e. face-to-face coaching, e-coaching and peer coaching), and resources (off-site coaching training, on-site core team/peer-coaching training, *Self-coaching Guide*). Loose integration between DD coaching models and procedural guidance supporting DD

practices is, therefore, important. While the DD1 workshop provides teachers with a high-level overview of DD's approach to classroom management, DD coaching is the support designed to prevent regression to past practice, develop proficiency, increase fidelity of implementation of core practices and improve long-term sustainability of the approach.

In sum, where my analytic framework focuses on the categorization of, design of, and interdependencies among formal and social supports, my findings, particularly with respect to on-site DD coaching (a chief DD support), point to the need to also include close examination of implementation of these supports. My findings, with regard to DD supports in relationship to its design for reactive/corrective discipline, also point to the need to treat specific capabilities of practice (e.g., teacher dispositions and mindsets, reactive/corrective discipline) as the point of departure to better ascertain potential categories and designs of supports best fit to facilitate their development.

CHAPTER VI

FINDINGS:

TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF SUPPORTS

Introduction

Again, analytically, the issue at hand is the coordination of (and interdependence between) formal and social supports for deep change in teachers' classroom practices. With DD as a case, the previous two research questions focused on describing and analyzing DD's designs and supports for practice.

In answering my first research question, about DD's design, I learned that: (a) DD's design for classroom management is both philosophical and theoretical in that it is built on philosophy, theory and research, yet, is also practical in that it includes a set of discrete teacher practices (i.e. DD's ten core practices); (b) DD's approach to classroom management represents a dramatic shift from modal school and teacher beliefs and practice; and (c) the necessary capabilities for practice commensurate with its design include: (a) dispositional traits (mindsets); (b) foundational knowledge; and (c) procedural skills/practical knowledge.

In answering my second research question, about DD's formal and social supports of practice, I learned that: (a) DD's formal supports emphasize procedural guidance; and (b) DD's social supports of practice emphasize experiential learning. I also learned that, while workshops are used to, principally, introduce teachers to the DD design, coaching is designed to develop implementation fidelity and sustainability of the DD approach. While there was a high degree of interdependence between workshop training and procedural guidance (on the one hand) and aspects of DD coaching and procedural guidance (on the other), there was a lower degree of integration between other aspects of DD coaching and procedural guidance (on the one hand) and the use of workshop training and procedural guidance focused on reactive/corrective discipline (on the other).

In this chapter, I take up the next research question: *What are teachers' perceptions regarding: (a) more/less valuable supports of practice; (b) the ways in which these supports shape/fail to shape teacher practice; and (c) factors that enable/constrain the development of*

capabilities for DD practice? The aim of this research question is to understand the supports that teachers—working in two high-implementing DD schools—found more and less useful in developing their capabilities for DD practice and the ways in which DD shaped, or failed to shape, their actual practice.

To answer this question, I analyzed transcripts from interviews conducted with teachers, school leaders, and two JGMS coaches, as well as teacher surveys.

My answer to this question is as follows. First: Teachers placed the highest value on DD's social supports for practice as well as locally created, school-based supports for practice. Teachers unanimously reported that DD1 – because of its focus on the use of experiential learning -- was among the best professional development trainings they had been to in their careers (if not the single best training). Nonetheless, DD2, rather than DD1, was the most critical support in developing teachers' capabilities for classroom management practice. Furthermore, following DD1 training, all participants described *school-based supports*—both administrator-driven and those leveraging teacher collaboration (whether structured or informal in nature)—as critical to initial and ongoing capability development. Despite the perceived value of DD workshops, teachers did not consider coaching—either DD expert coaching and internal (peer) coaching—as an important support for developing capabilities for DD. Neither did they view the formal supports of practice contained within DD media (e.g., procedural guidance, supplementary guidance, etc.) as sources of support, post-DD1 (and DD2) training.

Second: There was wide variation in teachers' perceptions about how DD shaped (or failed to shape) their classroom management practice, particularly with respect to reactive/corrective discipline (The Pathways of Self-Control) at the two school sites. There was wide variation in the ways in which teachers' reported DD shaped (or failed to shape) their practice, both *across* school sites and *within* them. With respect to the ways in which DD shaped teachers' practice across school sites, three analytical patterns emerged. These patterns included: (a) transforming, (b) expanding, and (c) reifying teacher understanding and practice. Moreover, with respect to each school site, while the Pathways of Self-Control (or Doorways) were well understood and generally employed by SMS teachers, most JGMS teachers reported not using most of the Pathways (with several JGMS teachers unable to recall many of them). These patterns were found in teacher interview data. There were no significant differences found in teacher survey results.

Third: Variation among teachers and between school sites was influenced heavily by several teacher-level and school-level factors. Teachers described a number of factors, outside of the direct control of Origins/DD, which enabled and constrained the development of capabilities for DD practice. One category of school-level factors included differences in school-context (i.e., school-leadership practice and the existence of other, competing school initiatives). Another category of factors included differences in teacher-level characteristics (i.e. teacher personality, style or mindset and regression to past practice).

Below, I detail my findings within five major sections: (1) how teachers valued key categories of DD supports of practice; (2) how teachers reported valuing localized, school-based supports; (3) patterns in how teachers reported DD shaped their practice; (4) the ways in which school context influenced DD practice; and, (5) the ways in which teacher-level characteristics influenced DD practice.

Review of School Sites, Participants, and Sources of Evidence

The two school sites included in this comparative case study were James Madison Middle School (JGMS) and Sibley Middle School (SMS). These schools were selected, in part, because they were considered high-implementing DD schools. Also, these schools were comparable in terms of student demographics and years of DD implementation. The sources of data included semi-structured interviews (primarily) and teacher surveys. Study participants included a total of 14 teachers (five from SMS; nine from JGMS), two school-leaders (SMS's assistant principal and JGMS's principal), two internal coaches (both from JGMS), and three DD leaders (all of whom served as DD coaches or consultants).

Although drawn from a convenience sample, at least one teacher from each core content area (i.e. Integrated Language Arts (ILA), math, science, social studies) and each grade-level (6-8) were included.⁴⁴ Several teachers at both schools taught more than one grade-level, and several JGMS teachers taught more than one content area. Though teachers ranged from early

⁴⁴ The five SMS teachers taught either math (two) or ILA (three). The nine JGMS teachers represented all four content area subjects (2-ILA/SS; 2-Science; 2-social studies; 3-ILA).

Also, the sample of teachers differed in interesting, if not important ways, between schools. For instance, most JGMS teachers included in the study were drawn from 7th grade (six out of nine teachers). Additionally, the majority of JGMS teacher (five in total, all 7th grade teachers) also assumed substantive leadership roles in their schools (e.g., department chair, grade-level leader, model classroom, pilot classroom, etc.). Further, four JGMS 7th grade teachers' reported participation in and college preparatory program. As a result, they reported one or more of their content area classes was comprised of mostly 'high-achieving, highly-motivated' students.

career teachers (those teaching five or less years) to teachers very near retirement, most participants were mid-career teachers (those with more than ten but less than twenty years of teaching experience). All teachers had participated DD1 training (some several times), and all SMS (and two JGMS teachers) teachers participated in DD1 and DD2.⁴⁵

Sources of evidence included participant interviews and teacher surveys. The primary source of evidence consisted of teacher interviews. Two interviews were conducted with each teacher and DD leader, and one interview was conducted with each school leader and internal coach.⁴⁶ Teacher surveys were the second source of evidence. Administered in the spring of 2015, during the same period in which teacher interviews were conducted, these surveys were used to triangulate teacher self-report data. Because teacher surveys were labeled anonymously in one school, all Spring 2015 teacher surveys for JGMS (N=30) and SMS (N=26) were included in analyses.

In contrast to interview data, teacher survey data did not yield any significant findings to report. For included survey scales, no significant variation existed between SMS and JGMS teachers' responses (descriptive statistics are included in Appendix A).

Teachers' Valuing of Supports of Practice in Developing Capabilities

All teachers reported unanimous praise for DD1 workshop training and attributed this praise to the interdependent use of formal and social supports. In particular, JGMS teachers reported that it was DD2 that contributed the most toward developing their capabilities to enact DD's design for classroom management. In other words, the results show that while JGMS and SMS teachers reported placing the highest value on DD workshop training, the post workshop supporting materials were deemed less valuable. The post-workshop supporting materials included DD media, external and internal coaching.

DD media and several categories of formal supports of practice contained within them (e.g., procedural guidance in the form of xyz) were primarily designed as print and electronic resource tools for teachers to access after the formal training workshop is completed. Many of the teachers admitted that following workshop training, they did not view DD media (and the

⁴⁵ Two veteran JGMS teachers reported participating in DD2 training as many as 5-10 years ago (according to their best recollection). They attended DD individually using district funds for professional development. Both JGMS teachers also reported not using and/or forgetting what they learned in DD2 and attributed this to the lack of school-wide implementation focus.

⁴⁶ One JGMS teacher declined to schedule a second interview.

formal supports contained with them) as a source of classroom management support, post-DD1 training. Additionally, when used, DD media were primarily utilized to plan for advisory, including transitioning to student-led advisory and to introduce teacher interns to the DD approach, rather than in supporting classroom management, specifically.

Similar to DD media, teachers reported that coaching—both external (DD expert coaching) and peer (internal coaching)—held little value to them in developing their capabilities for DD practice. The feedback from teachers suggests that DD expert coaching reportedly lacked frequency, focus, and feedback, and that internal coaching tended to focus on academic initiatives and goals (rather than on DD or classroom management).

All teachers unanimously praised DD1 workshop training. However, they reported that DD2 contributed the most toward developing their capabilities to enact DD's design for classroom management. Whereas DD1 praise was attributed to the interaction(s) between formal and social supports, JGMS teachers' praised DD2 for the ways in which it clarified the (mis)understanding and use of DD's approach to reactive/corrective discipline (i.e. The Pathways of Self-Control) following DD1 implementation.

Lastly, all participants—teachers, internal coaches, and school-level leaders—placed the highest value on the continued development of *school-based, localized* supports of practice. These supports were perceived as being indispensable in the development of initial and ongoing capabilities necessary to enact the DD approach.

DD's Formal Supports: Value and Use of DD Media

Neither JGMS teachers nor SMS teachers reported using DD media—either print or electronic—as sources of support for classroom management. As a result, following DD1 training, several categories of procedural guidance contained within these media were not used to develop teachers' classroom management capabilities. Rather than classroom management, the value of DD media was in its ability to enable teachers to easily plan for and enact advisory (one of ten DD core practices).

Teachers generally did not view DD media as sources for developing their capabilities for classroom management practice. This includes the DD1 (and DD2) Manual as well as the two books—Classroom Discipline: Guiding Adolescents to Responsible Independence (Crawford & Hagedorn, 2009) and The Classroom Discipline Study Guide (2012)—written entirely for the purposes of communicating and further developing DD's approach to classroom management.

For instance, few teachers perceived the DD1 (and DD2) Manual as a key source of support, following training. For instance, all four teachers who received Classroom Discipline: Guiding Adolescents to Responsible Independence (2009) reported that they had never read, yet alone, used it. One teacher, who reported using the DD1 Manual to introduce his teaching interns to DD, stated, “I haven't really revisited and read back through like any of the discipline structures or anything like that...I'm trying to just put what I learned into practice.” As a result, the formal supports of practice contained within DD print media—procedural guidance in the form of teacher language scripts, cognitive guidance, and supplementary guidance—were not leveraged by teachers post-DD1 training.

When DD media was used post-training, it was used in support of advisory only, a DD practice that was an explicit focus of DD implementation at both schools. Most teachers recalled referring to the DD1 Manual for advisory plans to varying degrees (if not entirely) during their first year of implementation. Mostly, it was used to support the capability development of teaching interns and students. For instance, all seven teachers who had successfully transitioned to student-led advisories reported using the DD1 Manual to guide students in planning and conducting their own advisories. Similarly, four teachers who had been assigned teaching interns all reported using The DD1 Manual to introduce their interns to advisory as well as the DD approach.

Notwithstanding the above examples, JGMS teachers reported planning for advisory as a key demand on their time but valued DD media other than the DD1 Manual (and the Advisory Book) that they viewed as more user-friendly and accessible. For instance, in lieu of the DD1 manual, teachers reported using *Tried and True: Classroom Games and Greetings* (2010) and the Origins (2010) website to support ongoing implementation of advisory. One JGMS teacher reported how she used DD's commercial publications rather than the DD1 Manual:

I use Tried and True. The DD1 Manual, I didn't use ever hardly use. I don't want to use the word "confusing," but it wasn't as practical as Tried and True. I looked through it a little bit that first year we started, but it didn't give me a clear road on where I needed to go. Because of that, I stopped using it.

Another JGMS teacher described how, during the second year of DD implantation, the DD website rather than the DD1 Manual was his preferred support:

Probably not so much the second year. I think once I understood the process and once I got into the website more, I don't think the actual manual was really necessary. I use the website a lot. And actually, when we plan student-led advisories, I have the kids on there too looking in the teacher resources area. They find their own game activities and they have to teach them to the advisory, so my advisory in particular is pretty familiar with the website.

Furthermore, because SMS teachers were provided with daily advisory plans by administration, thereby greatly reducing planning demands, they did not report frequently using DD materials to plan for advisory. Similar to JGMS teachers, SMS teachers also reported using DD materials to transition to student-led advisories, train interns and to modify or extend school-wide advisory plans.

DD's Social Supports: Value (and Limitations) of DD Training and Coaching

Rather than valuing DD media and the formal supports of practice embedded within them as stand-alone supports, teachers placed the highest value on learning DD in connection with social supports. With respect to the provision of DD supports of practice, teachers placed the highest value on participation in DD's weeklong trainings.

Whereas the DD1 workshop training was unanimously lauded by teachers because of the interplay between formal and social supports (i.e. learning about key aspects of the DD approach by way of both procedural guidance experiential learning modalities), it was DD2 that JGMS teachers reported was the most critical support of practice with respect to improving their understanding and implementation of the DD approach to classroom management, specifically.

Furthermore, the overwhelming majority of JGMS and SMS teachers did not value coaching as a key support in developing their capabilities for DD practice. Teachers reported that expert DD coaching tended to be infrequent and nonspecific, in both focus and the contents of post-observation feedback. On the other hand, internal coaching at JGMS employed a well-specified coaching framework, yet largely focused on initiatives and goals unrelated to DD and classroom management.

Value of training. In terms of DD supports of practice, all teachers reported that the most valuable supports were DD1 and DD2 weeklong trainings, albeit for different reasons. The value of DD1 lay in its inclusive use of both its formal and social supports of practice:

specifically, the interaction between core practices, content contained in the DD1 Manual, and the experiential and social learning modalities employed by DD1 facilitators.

However, in terms of developing capabilities for classroom management, specifically, JGMS teachers reported that it was DD2 that was the most critical DD support. Delivered two years after DD1, DD2 clarified critical misunderstandings and misapplications of the DD approach to classroom management, particularly as it related to The Pathways of Self-Control (DD's design for corrective or reactive discipline).

DD1: Experiential learning. Despite several reported drawbacks, JGMS and SMS teachers were unanimous in their praise of DD1 training.⁴⁷ Specifically, most teachers (13 of 14) considered the DD1 workshop among the best (if not single best) professional development that they had participated in during their teaching careers. These teachers attributed the value of DD1 to the interaction between discrete DD practices and experiential learning modalities employed during workshop training.

Teachers described a number of workshop activities that were consistent with the experiential learning modalities identified in the Chapter Five (e.g., role-playing, demonstration, modeling, immersion learning). Teachers also described DD's workshop in terms of the various ways it presented and represented the DD design. For example, teachers, such as the three quoted below, described the ways in which DD workshop facilitators provided opportunities for them to "see," "do", and discuss DD:

I think that is the best part of the whole training process. I've heard that from people: You're doing what you're expecting your kids to do. You know what it feels like for them to do it. I think that's one of the most beneficial parts of the process.

For me, it was that I had never been to a training before where you're actually participating in what they're talking about. Any workshop that I've ever been to always had small demonstrations, or little things that you'll do that would be something the student would do. But for DD, it was all of that and that was completely different...I think it's a really powerful workshop tool to actually immerse the teachers in what the

⁴⁷ Reported drawbacks of DD1 training included: the use of more passive/traditional training modalities (i.e. reading, lecture, etc.) when teaching DD's reactive management strategies; insufficient attention paid to teacher planning for advisory; and gaps between how DD classroom management practices were presented in workshop training and implementation challenges.

students will be doing and still talking about why is this a good strategy and where can you use this in your classroom.

I also liked that it was very hands-on. I was moving and doing things. I wasn't sitting in a desk, taking notes the entire time. I know they went to the book a little bit, but I think it was the right amount. It was "Let's actually apply what we're talking about," and not just like "Here's the tools, but I'm not going to show you how to use them."

Additionally, most JGMS teachers and several SMS teachers reported community building (among school staff) as both a key feature and byproduct of DD1. One JGMS teacher described the training as pushing her out of her "comfort zone" and making JGMS staff "closer." One SMS teacher described the training as being effective in building a sense of urgency around and commitment to post-training implementation among staff by stating, "At the end of the week we all felt...closer together. Which I know sounds kind of weird because we teach together all the time, but...it felt like our building was on the same page."

DD2: Correcting misunderstandings (and applications) of DD's approach to reactive discipline (The Pathways of Self-Control). All SMS participants (teachers and assistant principal) reported that, following DD1, many teachers held common misconceptions concerning The Pathways of Self-Control (i.e. the set of strategies DD uses to redirect/correct student misbehavior). According to SMS participants, these misconceptions involved conceiving of The Pathways in ways that typify traditional discipline approaches: that is, teachers tended to conceive of The Pathways as linear, progressive, sequential responses to student misbehavior. As a result, the DD2 workshop facilitator dedicated significant part the workshop to clarifying such misunderstandings (and wrongful enactment) of The Pathways. In an effort to rectify teacher understanding (and enactment) of DD's approach to reactive discipline, the DD2 facilitator referred to The Pathways of Self-Control as "The Doorways of Problem-Solving" (or, simply, "Doorways").⁴⁸

Most SMS teachers reported that differences in understanding and buy-in concerning The Pathways existed both during and following DD1 training. SMS teachers said they generally understood (and accepted) DD's approach to proactive/preventative discipline. However, several

⁴⁸ DD leaders reported that only one of their workshop facilitators used the phrase "The Doorways of Problem-Solving" and, to their knowledge, only during his workshop facilitation at SMS. One DD leader, who also provided services to SMS, reported that, thereafter, SMS staff largely referred to "Pathways" as the "Doorways."

teachers described DD1 as filled with “tension” and confusion when it came to The Pathways (or The Doorways). Below, two SMS teachers offer their reflection of DD1 training in light of the conflicts it elicited:

I think a lot of times what I remember hearing from my colleagues within the DD1 workshop was: “How do you do this? What happens when this happens? What do you do when this happens?” I think a lot of people...missed it. You're asking “what if?” questions based on what you think is going to happen from your past experiences. But you haven't implemented these other (proactive/preventative DD) strategies yet, your language, etc. You haven't done that yet.

I don't want to speak for all my colleagues, but our last couple of conversations [during DD1] were really big on, “What do I do with this kid that's doing “this”?” They were looking for a disciplinary action system and I think that was why we had to spend some time on it [i.e. The Pathways during DD2] to let them know, “Look it's not like it has to be this, then this, then this...I think that's why we did spend some time on that.

SMS teachers also reported that, due to teachers' conflicting philosophies and approaches to classroom management, the issues described above were left largely unresolved during and immediately following DD1 workshop training.

All SMS teachers and their assistant principal reported that their DD2 workshop training clarified the aforementioned (mis)understandings of The Pathways and, consequently, corrected the way many teachers implemented them. They reported that their DD2 workshop facilitator dedicated a significant part the workshop to clarifying such misunderstandings (and wrongful enactment) of The Pathways. In an effort to rectify teacher understanding (and enactment) of DD's approach to reactive discipline, the DD2 facilitator referred to The Pathways of Self-Control as “The Doorways of Problem-Solving” (or, simply, “Doorways”). Notably, the DD2 workshop facilitator's recasting of The Pathways as “The Doorways of Problem-Solving” was integral in shifting teachers' understandings of The Pathways. Teachers reported that—rather than a sequential, linear approach—they began to understand each pathway as a “doorway,” or option, they could use in no particular order, to help students self-correct as needed. As such, “the doorways” acted as a school-wide heuristic for understanding and enacting DD's approach to reactive discipline during and post-DD2 training. One SMS teacher aptly summarized the

ways in DD2 clarified misunderstanding of DD's approach to reactive discipline and use of The Pathways:

I think he did a really, really good job of delivering how you use the pathway doors...I remember her really going into depths trying to clarify for teachers that these were really good ways or pathways to help kids. I think she did a good job of saying that, "Hey, this is not a discipline system. Look, this is not a hierarchy system. It isn't like you have to have these in order." I mean it's discipline for your classroom but it's not a system that you have to go through this doorway before you go through this doorway. I think she did a really good job clarifying that.

Moreover, another SMS teacher remarked how DD2 shifted both her personal understanding and application of The Pathways of Self-Control:

In DD2, I was actually a little bit confused because we had been told that it was going to be a system. I was in under the impression, and so were some other teachers, that in DD like there's like a process: First, you give them a visual reminder; then you give them a verbal reminder. Then if they're still not listening, then you give them a take a break, and then you give them a TAB out. That was my understanding for a year or two...So, for DD2, they said, "no, actually, there's all these different things that you can do, and they don't have to be in order." They called it "the doorways to problem-solving."

In sum, although DD1 training materials were primarily focused on DD's approach to classroom management, DD2 provided an opportunity for DD workshop facilitators to identify and clarify post-DD1 implementation mistakes and challenges.

(De)valuing of coaching. While teachers viewed both external and internal coaching (and coaches) positively, they did not value coaching as a key support in developing capabilities for DD practice or DD's approach to classroom management, specifically. Two themes emerged as reasons for this. First, teachers either did not receive DD expert coaching support or reported that it was infrequent and lacked focus and specific feedback. Second, although internal coaching at JGMS was considered a rich, robust support valued by all JGMS teachers for developing instructional capabilities, it was rarely employed to develop teachers' classroom management capabilities.⁴⁹

⁴⁹ JGMS was highly committed to the use of internal coaching as a key, school-wide support of practice. According to spring 2015 JGMS teacher survey data, 82.8% of surveyed teachers (N=30) reported receiving internal coaching

External (DD expert) coaching.⁵⁰ Perceptions of DD expert coaching supports appeared to vary according to the particular DD coach teachers came in contact with and, by extension, the coaching model employed. While all SMS teachers reported being coached one or more times by a DD expert coach, they also reported that coaching was infrequent and lacked focus and specific feedback. On the other hand, the only JGMS teacher who received DD expert coaching reported more frequent and focused coaching interactions. She also viewed DD expert coaching as an important support in developing her classroom management capabilities (and more so than internal coaching).

The two expert DD coaches at SMS and the single DD expert coach at JGMS appeared to leverage different approaches to providing coaching supports. While all SMS teachers reported receiving external coaching supports at some point during three years of implementation, these teachers reported that these supports were infrequent. They also reported that both the focus of observations and the feedback they received were positive but non-specific and indirect. Below, one SMS teacher describes the informal nature of the coaching sessions (with two different DD coaches) he participated in:

It wasn't formalized. It wasn't like anything specific that I got feedback on or anything like that. When we spoke, she was very pleased. It was very positive...but nothing real direct or specific.

I think it was more informal....He was just looking to see what I knew from our conversations and then giving me a little bit of feedback and just chatting. I don't think it was very formalized...I don't think there was so much of a focus on feedback. I remember it being a very high-powered conversation.

supports during the 2014-2015 school year (this item was not included in SMS's teacher survey). Both JGMS coaches as well as the principal reported plans to hire a third, and possibly a fourth, coach for the following school year.

⁵⁰ Whereas DD expert coaching was made available to SMS throughout DD implementation, it was only provided to JGMS for the first year. According to spring 2015 JGMS teacher survey data, only 17.2% of teachers reported receiving external coaching supports (i.e. expert DD coaching) during the 2014-2015 school year (first year of SMS's DD implementation) (this item was not included in SMS's teacher survey). The principal investigators of the study from which this dissertation builds on communicated that JGMS's principal wanted internal coaches to be responsible for providing DD coaching supports.

Another SMS teacher described how, despite considering both of her coaching interactions positive and enjoyable, she did not consider visits by DD expert coaches as “coaching,” as the term is generally understood:

I think coaching would be a lot more time-intensive. Not just a drop by, half day visit, you know what I mean? Coaching would take real observation, maybe taping, and then going over the tapes and saying "What went wrong here?" things like that. I think we're supposed to have that. Furthermore, while two SMS teachers reported that brief feedback was given one-on-one following classroom observations (i.e. immediately following class, during lunch, after-school), three teachers reported that DD expert coaches provided generalized observational feedback to SMS teachers during staff meetings.

The DD expert coach at JGMS, on the other hand, employed a more traditional coaching framework that included: a pre-observation meeting, goal setting, an explicit observational focus (in this case, on classroom management), and a formal debrief ending in goal-setting for the next observation. Below, the teacher describes the steps her DD expert coach followed and the focus of her visits:

I met with her before she started her visits and I kind of told her my goals, which I think last year it was more of the management stuff as well as the language. After each visit, we'd meet that same day. I would do some reflecting with her, she would add to that with her own feedback, and then we'd set up what I would like her to look for in the next visit. Further, external coaching supports were provided the year immediately following DD1 training, and occurred approximately three times. This teacher -- who was highly committed to DD and reported that DD was her management “system” -- perceived DD expert coaching as “super valuable” and the most useful support of practice outside of DD1 workshop training. She also expressed a strong desire for continued DD expert coaching.

Internal (peer) coaching (JGMS). JGMS had two full-time internal coaches. Both coaches attended a DD1 workshop, received intense training in well-recognized coaching models (cognitive coaching; literacy coaching; instructional coaching) as well as ongoing in-district and out-of-district professional development.⁵¹ Additionally, JGMS coaches employed a number of

⁵¹ Coaches reported being very well trained in coaching models and practices. They attended Columbia University's Teachers' College Reading and Writing Project training over several consecutive summers. They also reported attending five of Jim Knight's training sessions on the cognitive coaching model. Additionally, JGMS coaches described the provision of district-level coaching supports such as a district-wide coaches' PLC facilitated by a

robust coaching modalities in their work with teachers.⁵² Eight of the nine JGMS teachers reported working with (at least) one coach, several rather extensively so, during the two years of DD implementation. However, both JGMS coaches and teachers reported that DD, and classroom management specifically, were rarely a focus of internal coaching. Moreover, in the rare occasions DD's approach to classroom management was a focus of coaching at JGMS, teachers reported that such coaching was generally ineffective, largely due to factors not under the direct control of coaches. Thus, while JGMS teachers regarded internal coaching as a critical support in developing their capabilities for instructional practice, it was not viewed as an integral support for classroom management practice post-DD1 training.

Focus on non-DD initiatives. Both JGMS teachers and coaches reported that internal coaching rarely focused on classroom management or DD.⁵³ Rather, internal coaching tended to focus on providing teachers with support around specific content area curricular initiatives (e.g., Balanced Literacy in the Integrated Language Arts department), school-wide academic initiatives (e.g., Assessment for Learning), and other, mostly instructional, goals identified by individual teachers.

One JGMS coach described the scope of his work with teachers as wider-ranging than that of his coaching colleague. Whereas his colleague's coaching was mostly literacy focused, his work was focused largely on other aspects of instruction. Specifically, he described his work during the school year as mostly focused on developing teachers' capabilities around Assessment for Learning (AFL) practices (such as "conferring with students" and "providing descriptive

cognitive coaching "champion." One JGMS coach had previously been trained in Responsive Classroom (RC) by Linda Crawford and had worked as a RC trainer for several years. Coaches' reported that they had not received any training related to providing coaching supports for DD or classroom management, specifically.

⁵² Both JGMS teachers and internal coaches described typical coaching "steps," practices (or modalities) and "coaching cycles" employed in coaching. The steps included: a preconference (to establish goals), observation of a lesson and post-observation debrief (focused on reflective dialogue). The coaching modalities included: observing a coach in the morning during her instructional and advisory classroom periods; data collection (e.g., collecting observation data tied to teacher goals; assisting teachers in developing data collection instruments such as student surveys); videotaping and analysis; co-conducted peer observation of colleague(s); co-planning; co-teaching; modeling and demonstration; and guided reflection. Coaching cycles referred to the frequency of interactions between coach and teacher. For instance, "shorter cycle" coaching was described as more or less "a one shot deal," whereas a "longer cycle" coaching interaction coaching was described as lasting for weeks, if not months.

⁵³ Coaches reported that classroom management was rarely, if ever, identified by teachers as an improvement goal and was only an issue for a small handful of teachers (i.e. between 5-8 teachers). Additionally, six of nine JGMS teachers did not perceive themselves as having any classroom management issues.

feedback”) and, as always, their own individually determined instructional goals (e.g., creating and analyzing student survey data, unit planning, etc.).

Furthermore, the five JGMS teachers who taught at least one course of Integrated Language Arts (ILA) reported working closely with one coach over sustained periods of time (weeks and/or months) in order to implement literacy initiatives, namely Balanced Literacy (BL). These five ILA teachers also reported that BL demanded dramatic changes in terms of instructional philosophy, content and teaching practices. These shifts, in turn, necessitated frequent, ongoing coaching interactions. As explained by one ILA teacher below:

Just being a language arts teacher, the Balanced Literacy model was a huge shift in how we teach. Just the philosophy of how it works was huge. Because prior to this, three years ago, we were teaching out of a textbook and things were very disjointed. You couldn't say if you were at this building, you got these things. We had our core things we had to teach within the grade, but every teacher kind of made their own curriculum, put together their own things. This is the first time everything is streamlined and we're all on the same page. So, if a student goes from this middle school to this other middle school in our district, they'll be in the same unit, have gotten the same information.

Another ILA teacher reported that, for the duration of the previous school year, she spent every single preparation hour observing one coach's laboratory classroom period to better understand and implement literacy initiatives.

Furthermore, the three additional JGMS teachers who received internal coaching support also reported that their work with coaches was largely focused on instruction and considered it critical to the ongoing development of their instructional capabilities. For instance, the science teacher worked with a coach over several weeks to improve instruction around students' writing of science laboratory reports. Two social studies teachers reported working with a coach (but did not specify the academic nature of these interactions). One of them reported that internal coaching was so valuable that he worked with a JGMS coach nearly every school day and had done so for years.

Indirect exposure to DD (vs. explicit coaching). Several JGMS teachers reported that DD and classroom management were embedded in their work with internal coaches but that neither of these was an explicit or primary focus. For example, one JGMS teacher responded, “not any direct DD coaching, no,” to a question regarding the nature of her work with internal coaches.

However, this teacher also described the ways in which a coaching interaction explicitly focused on how co-teaching a literacy unit helped to expose her to the coach's use of DD classroom management practices:

She was in my room for two weeks. It's interesting to see. We co-taught—that kind of like back and forth with her leading the class versus me leading the class—and she's so good with her Responsive Classroom stuff. It's just natural for her to do things, things that I had to remember, “Oh yeah, I could have...” There were two kids that were continuing on their conversation after our turn and talk was done....She was able to address them. I probably would've just let it go.

Teachers did report, however, that they were able to identify DD philosophy and practices embedded in their interactions with coaches. This was by way of observing DD practice in one coach's advisory and laboratory classroom periods and in coaching modalities such as demonstration, modeling, and co-teaching. Another teacher described how spending an hour every day observing the same coach teach in her own classroom, for the purpose of improving her implementation of Balanced Literacy, also helped her understand DD practices such as Take a Break (TAB):

Most of the time, of course, the focus was on literacy, because that's her area of expertise. She was originally hired for was the literacy piece. But you can see how she incorporates DD in her classroom. I observed Brook almost every day last year because Balanced Literacy was something that I was new to, because I had taught math. So, I observed her almost every day to see how she was implementing it, like, Take A Break.

Although the modeling of DD practices by JGMS's coach was unintentional, observing the coach's implicit use of DD helped develop this teacher's capabilities for DD practice.

Negative perceptions of coaching focused directly on DD. When asked to focus on DD, teachers had mixed reports regarding internal coaching's usefulness, particularly in developing their capabilities for classroom management. The reasons for this negative perception included: (a) the ineffectiveness of DD practices with chronically challenged students; (b) logistical issues that coaching was unable to correct; and (c) the lack of advanced DD-specific training received by coaches. All JGMS teachers reported the first two reasons as among key implementation challenges they (or their colleagues) faced post-DD1 training.

Three JGMS teachers reported that at least one of their coaching sessions focused directly on DD. These coaching sessions focused primarily on setting up and troubleshooting advisory (e.g., brainstorming ideas around facilitating advisory with challenged students; addressing space, furniture, and time constraints) and Take a Break (TAB) as well as assistance with conducting a problem-solving conferencing with a challenging group of students. These three teachers also reported that these problems largely remained unresolved following coaching sessions. One JGMS teacher described how the peer coaching she received were not effective in resolving her specific implementation challenges:

Again, the coaching I've had, it didn't help. When I looked at my classroom set-up and the "take a break" and all of that and my classroom...The coaches have come in and said, "Do this," and "Try this," and it just hasn't worked.

A second JGMS teacher, who asked a coach to help facilitate a problem-solving conference with a group of behaviorally challenged girls, also mentioned the failure of coaching to help alleviate her specific challenge (it later "resolved itself"). Similarly, another JGMS teacher stated that, despite brainstorming with a coach around troubleshooting a particularly difficult cohort of advisory students, difficulties remained for the duration of the school year.

JGMS teachers attributed these ineffective outcomes largely to factors they viewed as not under internal coaches' direct control and influence. These factors included unintended effects of the use of DD with behaviorally challenged students, logistical constraints, insufficient resources, and the lack of coaches' advanced training in DD.

All JGMS teachers reported that TAB/TAB Out did not work with the most behaviorally challenged students and, instead, often led to more disruption. The teacher with the particularly difficult advisory group reported that the demands of advisory (e.g., playing games, sharing, social interaction, etc.) "exasperated their deficits" rather than helped to mitigate them. Additionally, several JGMS teachers also identified logistical constraints (e.g., immobile furniture, spacing issues, and insufficient time to enact all four advisory components) and lack of resources (advisory materials) as challenges that coaching was unable to address. For instance, one teacher reported that the ways in which her coach modeled advisory and TAB/TAB Out were not feasible in her own classroom due to such constraints. One less experienced teacher, who worked extensively with internal coaches (and the only JGMS teacher who received expert DD coaching support), reported that she did not view internal coaching as a useful support with

regard to DD. She attributed this, in part, to internal coaches' lack of advanced DD training. As she explains below:

Right now, like I had said before, I don't feel like they are more trained than anybody else. So I don't think its as powerful as it could be ...I think having them be more trained than a lot of the other staff in the building will be helpful... They'll be able to suggest different kinds of activities for the kids to be doing and different ways to approach different things. I think that will be really powerful.

This teacher and the two coaches were scheduled to attend DD2 in the summer. This teacher, as well as a coach and the school principal, reported plans for her to accompany the two internal coaches to a DD2 workshop during the summer. Following DD2 training, her classroom would serve as a model classroom for the integration of school-wide initiatives, including DD.

The Value of Localized, School-Based Supports of Practice

One theme that emerged in interviews with teachers (and school leaders and internal coaches) was the value they placed on school-based, *localized* supports of practice. All study participants (i.e. teachers, coaches, school leaders) viewed school-level social supports—particularly those that leveraged teacher expertise—as the key to ongoing development of capabilities of practice.⁵⁴ By school-based, localized supports, I mean formal and social supports of practice that emerge within individual schools and among school officials (i.e. school-level leaders, teacher teams, individual teachers, internal coaches) rather than those imported from external sources (e.g., external partners).

Both schools shared some similarities in terms of the types of localized, school-based supports they created. However, the most valued sources of localized supports varied notably across the two school sites. For instance, both schools created implementation supports around advisory and TAB/TAB Out; integrated other school-wide initiatives within advisory; and embedded aspects of DD philosophy and DD practices into staff meetings and professional development. While SMS favored more administrator-driven localized supports of practice, JGMS favored more teacher-driven supports.

⁵⁴ Several JGMS teachers also reported on the limitations of internal supports and the desire for these supports to be coupled with ongoing DD training and expert coaching. For instance, one teacher who was highly committed to DD reported that school-level PD options were geared toward teachers with less buy-in and knowledge of DD. Two JGMS teachers remarked that although the school made a good faith effort to keep DD “alive” (e.g., embedding DD into staff meetings and school PD offerings), these efforts were not equivalent to the expertise provided by external DD consultants.

The Types, Focus, and Value of Localized Supports

Whereas JGMS's most valued localized supports were largely in the form of more incidental, collegial exchanges and problem-solving among teachers, SMS's most valued school-based supports were in the form of administrator-created, formal supports of practice (in addition to individual, teacher-created formal supports). Moreover, while JGMS's localized supports focused largely on assisting teachers with initial advisory planning (and ongoing integration of DD within academics), SMS's localized supports focused on eliminating planning demands for advisory entirely and encouraging teachers' use of a wider-range of DD practices (including DD language and The Pathways of Self-Control).

Teacher-centered (and incidental, collegial) supports (JGMS). Following DD1 training, most JGMS teachers reported that localized supports created by (or emanating from interactions with) teacher colleagues were their primary source of DD support. Five JGMS teachers, all of whom were on the 7th grade-level team and hallway, reported that their most valued school-based support consisted of mostly unplanned, incidental professional exchanges. Such exchanges lead to the cultivation of shared resources, decision-making, and problem-solving around DD.

All nine teachers JGMS conveyed that, post DD1 training, their most pressing concern centered on how to plan for advisory and, secondarily, how to integrate DD into academics. One teacher described the difficulties she faced transitioning from DD1 training to classroom implementation:

I think the biggest thing was I felt that there were some pieces missing, in terms of I didn't know where to start. I knew that they were all these resources. I knew walking out of there that I had to build, you know, you have the person with the three rings, autonomy, relationships, whatever, community. I knew I had to build that in the classroom, but I was completely in the dark about: What does this look like in my classroom? How do I set up an advisory?

Furthermore, while school-based supports included advisory plans for the first few weeks of school (developed by the JGMS leadership team), all JGMS teachers reported that, thereafter, they were largely "left on their own" with respect to advisory planning demands. Several JGMS teachers reported that many teachers viewed advisory as an "extra prep," requiring significant if not substantial planning time.

Initial planning supports were replaced by the existence (or nonexistence) of collaborative, yet more incidental, teacher collaborations. For instance, five JGMS teachers reported that they created a Google Document folder to share advisory plans with their grade-level peers. Furthermore, to address common behavior issues, this folder was expanded to include a list of agreed-upon grade- and classroom-level routines (including those which teachers could exercise autonomy and discretion) and pictures of teachers' Y- and T-charts to accompany them.

These five teachers also reported that much of this collegial support came in the form of unplanned interactions and exchanges that resulted from a cohesive team culture and collective commitment to DD that was unique to the 7th grade team and hallway. Below, four 7th grade JGMS teachers describe their grade-level team's collaborative culture and commitment to DD:

We talk, we discuss: "What are you doing today," or, "What's your plan? How are we doing this? Are we bringing different activities in as a group?" We're going to do this as a seventh-grade team; let's all go through this. So, that support is there for us. We're a very collaborative group, so that support is there for us.

The 7th grade level is very proactive with making sure we're all doing what we need to do. But that's just the way we do with everything in our grade.

It could be the combination of teachers or it's just 7th grade I don't know what it is but the teachers seemed really supportive and just really on board like we really get it. Like we believe in it. We're like, "yeah we can see this, and we can understand why this would be good for kids".

It was pretty constant. I'd be like... "okay I tried this and that didn't work" or "I tried this and it really worked well" and then my colleague would say, "hey, have you tried doing it like this?" or "hey, I did something like that except it was a little different." We were constantly sharing ideas... I feel the 7th grade did a good job of that.

In stark contrast to the sense of cohesion among JGMS' 7th grade teachers, JGMS 6th and 8th grade teachers did not receive strong support for DD from their grade-level teams and colleagues. For example, 7th grade teachers who also taught one 6th or 8th grade class reported

receiving little/no support for DD from these grade-level teams and colleagues. In comparing her experiences attending 6th and 7th grade-level team meetings, one JGMS teacher expressed her realization of this difference when she said, “It’s through those meetings that I kind of got the sense that not in all grades is it as strong as I felt it was in 7th grade.”

Administrator-centered (and individually-created) supports (SMS). Teachers at SMS reported that their most valued supports of practice post DD1 training were school-based supports, particularly those developed by their assistant principal. The assistant principal was at the forefront of SMS’s decision to adopt DD. She continued to be the primary advocate for DD by providing “wrap around support” to the extent that one teacher remarked, “if she wasn’t keeping us on track, it would have faded even more.” Coupled with administrator-originated supports of practice, teachers also reported individually created supports that they considered critical to supporting the enactment of DD practice, particularly as it pertained to DD’s approach to classroom management.

SMS’s assistant principal developed several localized supports to help develop teachers’ capabilities for DD practice. SMS teachers reported that these supports included: incorporating DD practices into faculty and staff meetings; daily advisory plans; weekly emails encouraging teachers to use specific DD practices; including formal evaluative feedback as well as informal conversations; offering to cover teachers’ classes to facilitate observations of peers’ advisory periods; developing summer workshop training for new staff and interns; assigning new staff to DD-trained teachers (until DD training was available); and lastly, videotaping teachers who excelled in specific DD practices and sharing these video-clips in staff meetings.

The localized supports of practice JGMS teachers found most useful in developing their capabilities for DD practice were the school-wide daily plans for advisory as well as weekly reminders encouraging them to use certain DD practices. The daily plans were created as PowerPoint presentations—complete with Daily News, Greeting, Share/Game and Activity—to guide teachers (and students) in the enacting each advisory component.⁵⁵ Two SMS teachers, below, praise the advisory plans created by their assistant principal:

⁵⁵ The assistant principal (and several teachers) stated that teachers were not contractually obligated to plan for advisory, a period of unstructured time in the school schedule that predated the implementation of DD. As a result, she began providing loose guidance by directing teachers to enact specific advisory lessons in *The Advisory Book*. However, “that still requires you to find your book, read it ahead of time get your materials or whatever and I didn’t trust the staff at the time that they would actually do the work.” By providing teachers with a written advisory

She does all our set up for us, I mean she makes it think so user friendly. It is ridiculous. You come in and you already know what you are teaching for that whole week in CCA advisory. So, from that same point it is like flawless. I mean what she does is amazing.

It makes things simpler for me because I don't have to plan it so it's pretty straightforward and easy to implement.

Included in the weekly email to teachers (which also attached advisory plans) were suggestions to focus on one or more DD practices for the week, such as a type of DD language, noticing, or a specific doorway. Teachers reported that these weekly emails helped keep these particular DD practices at the forefront of their thinking. As one SMS teacher reported:

A lot of times, in that email that we get on Sunday nights with our [advisory] lesson plans for the week, she also will remind us. "Remember to use" a certain something like reminding language this week or "remember to notice"... "I noticed..." or say "today I noticed that students..." or whatever it is. She'll change it up every week so that there's something we should focus on.

Teachers reported that the assistant principal would often follow-up on these suggestions by having teachers discuss the ways in which they incorporated the specific DD practice(s) she identified in her email during weekly staff meetings.

Teachers also reported resources that they created following DD training (or planned to create) -- such as visual reminders and protocols -- aimed at supporting their continued use (and students' understanding) of The Pathways of Self-Control (i.e. Doorways). For example, three SMS teachers (and SMS principal) had decals of each pathway on their classroom (and office) walls. One SMS teacher described how she used these visuals as a self-accountability tool and to introduce students to (and remind them of) DD's specific redirections:

I have a "doorways to success" board in my room and so it has all these doors on it and it has all the words on it like "take a break," "reflective language," "reminder," "out of the classroom conversation," ...like all those different choices that I can use as a teacher. And I kind of discuss those with my students. I try to tell them at the beginning of the year, "I really want to have a positive atmosphere in the classroom and these are the ways that we

"script," teachers were contractually obligated to follow them, thereby increasing the likelihood that advisory would be implemented with fidelity.

can be successful. But if something does happen where we have some sort of discrepancy or somebody who is upset or whatever it is, these are my tools that I can use as a teacher to help you.”

Another SMS teacher stated her desire to make the use of decals of The Pathways of Self-Control a more uniform school-wide practice:

I wish that everyone had the same thing in their classrooms so that it was uniform. All the students would see the same thing; the same way teachers are managing in every classroom so they're use to it.

SMS teachers reported that these decals originated in discussions about the pathways (now termed “doorways”) following their DD2 workshop training. During this workshop, one teacher created decals for her room to help her with her corrected understanding of the pathways, a practice that was replicated by several other SMS teachers. According to one SMS teacher, “A lot more of us are getting the doorways up, so that it's more visual reminder of what we do. I think that's...more consistent this year than it's been in the past.” This same teacher reported that he created decals for each of the five types of DD language as well. Creating decals for each type of DD language was done in response to post-observation feedback given by the assistant principal regarding his need to incorporate more DD language into his practice. As this teacher explained: “[The assistant principal asked,] ‘Can you make sure you’re using the language?’ So that’s when I generated that [points to DD language decals on wall]. I’m like, ‘yeah, I just need a reminder.’”

Furthermore, another SMS teacher described modifying the school’s existing Think Sheet—a form students complete to help them establish the cause, effect and alternatives to misbehavior—in order to give his students the ability to self-select one of Pathways. This teacher explained that the purpose of the classroom decals and the modified Think Sheet was to help students with “seeing the pathways or doorways; to bring the kids on board with saying, ‘Hey, look man, there’s lot of opportunities you have if you are off task.’”

Valuing of Collective Teacher Expertise in Developing Capabilities for Practice

Rather than resting on DD’s formal or social supports, all participants (teachers, coaches, school-level leaders) emphasized that the ongoing development of capabilities for DD practice was dependent on the intentional and strategic cultivation of *school-based, localized supports* of

practice.⁵⁶ Furthermore, although the localized supports identified by teachers included some mention of coaching (external and internal), they focused most heavily on localized supports that could identify, diffuse, and facilitate *teacher* expertise and collective problem-solving.

The types of localized supports planned for future use varied somewhat between JGMS and SMS. However, key supports shared by both sets of teachers included: peer mentoring, observing other teachers' use of DD practices, and expanding the use of video-based professional development. JGMS teachers strongly emphasized the importance of developing school-based supports as the key to solving an array of DD related issues (e.g., teacher buy-in, implementation challenges).

Both JGMS and SMS teachers reported that, to at least some degree, DD expertise—in select practices and dispersed among certain teachers—existed within their schools. Similarly, they also reported a desire to have time and access to the ways in which their peers understood, used and problem-solved around DD implementation. A JGMS teacher statement echoed that of other JGMS teachers, coaches, and the school principal: “We have a lot of people who know what they are doing. We have the resources *here* already. There’s just no time [to share ideas and problem-solve collectively].” Likewise, a SMS teacher stated, “I just want to know what other teachers' visions are; what it could look like for DD.”

JGMS teachers most strongly emphasized the need to strategically cultivate school-based, social supports.⁵⁷ Several JGMS teachers reported that cultivating school-based social supports was key to increasing collective buy-in for DD and resolving teachers' classroom management issues. Several JGMS teachers reported how important it was to “see DD in action” in other teachers' classrooms in order to develop ongoing capabilities for DD practice. For instance, three SMS teachers below described how observing peers' use of DD practices was especially for teachers who struggled with classroom management or who lacked commitment to DD:

⁵⁶ JGMS teachers in particular reported disappointment in not having yet participated in DD2 and the negative toll they believed not having sustained contact with DD consultants over two years had on implementation. Additionally, most teachers at both schools reported wanting/needing additional training in how to integrate DD within academic content and in light of other, more pressing demands (e.g., testing, curricula) and constraints (e.g., time).

⁵⁷ The principal at JGMS reported that leveraging teacher expertise was also a way to deal with what she perceived as the cost prohibitiveness and time demands of DD's social supports (e.g., DD 2). She and one JGMS coach described budget cuts as indicative of the district's 'financial crises' as well as drastic reductions in time allocated by the district to professional development.

If you have a student that's not responding in your classroom and is a difficult individual in your class, yet is completely peaceful and mild mannered and engaged in another one, I personally would be curious in what's going in that other classroom that's not happening in mine. And I think observing that gets rid of the "well they just do this in mine but not anything else. Seeing someone else deal with that kid or have that connection with them, it's going to be beneficial to anybody to be able to see and learn from that.

I think -- especially hard for those teachers who are not necessarily buying in -- coming into the classrooms of teachers who are doing this program and doing it well and with authenticity and just getting them to see it in real action. I think it's different to go to a training and participate in the activities, than to see it transfer and see it actually happening with kids, I think that's so, so, so powerful. For teachers that aren't doing it, that's one of the only ways that it's going to get better.

Giving them time to talk with a trusting person. I don't know who it might be for them—whether it's an admin person, a colleague, somebody in another department, just a good friend in their school building—but asking that person who is not succeeding with it, for whatever reason, to just sit down and talk privately with that person and see what's the issue, would be a place to start...If people trust each other enough to talk about it and share their feelings and then that's something that...that admin, or the rest of the team, colleagues, team of colleagues for that grade level or that subject area, can help with or that person can come in to another classroom to observe...how it might be implemented, to see for themselves that it works and it's not totally threatening and that it can be done.

Several SMS teachers described the importance of cultivating localized, social supports for practice to develop the capabilities of even the most committed DD practitioners. For example, one SMS teacher below described how collaborative structures (i.e. peer observation) could help teachers' problem-solve implementation challenges as well as diffuse localized expertise:

The best thing would be the collaboration on it. I think that works best somebody that really knows the components well to actually come in and oversee what you're doing or

make regular visits to check and have conversations... Being able to actually see from another person's viewpoint and then being able to share or them being able to expound on where they're having difficulty with and having someone that's not having that difficulty be able to fill in those gaps. "Oh, I do that, too, but here's what I do to incorporate that part into my classroom." So having that time for that collaboration would probably be huge, extremely beneficial.

In sum, observing other teachers' use of DD was mentioned not only as a way of dealing with ongoing behavior issues post-DD training but also as a way to serve as a "proof of concept" for teachers who had low-buy in or were otherwise resistant to DD.

Further, in addition to localized social supports of practice, JGMS teachers reported the need for several types of school-based, administrator-driven supports not mentioned by SMS participants. These supports included integrating DD into the existing work of school-level teams and teacher evaluation protocols as well as actively monitoring teachers' use of DD practices. Below, three JGMS teachers describe why they considered formal supports—such as requiring DD be placed on team meeting agendas and (re)instituting administrative walkthroughs—integral to developing capabilities for DD practice:

We have PLC's twice, if not, three times a month. I don't know if it is on everybody's agenda. If it were required to be on the agenda, it would probably be done more, being more of a conscience effort of "what are you doing?" "what are the struggles you're having?" and to have those conversations throughout the year. I don't know if that's happening. That would probably be something beneficial.

I don't feel like the building administrator level has really held people super accountable to doing it. I think it needs to be more at a forefront so I don't know if training is the right word. I think the ongoing training is really kind of the key, that it's at the forefront of the expectations; however, if you're not being evaluated on your use of it—what expectations I would see when I walk into your classroom—well then you it's not, you know, getting done.

That's the thing with everything in education: unless we're constantly throwing it in their face, giving them just what they need, people are either going to run with it and do it on their own, or they're just going to fizzle and go away.

JGMS's principal also reported the need to better monitor her teachers' use of DD practices and described plans to reestablish administrative walkthroughs next fall, a practice she employed during the school's first year of DD implementation.

Shaping DD Practice: Patterns in Teacher Change

Despite teachers sharing patterns in their valuation of DD's formal and social supports (and school-based supports), there was variation among teachers concerning the ways in which DD influenced their classroom management practice. Two themes emerged. First, three analytic categories used to describe this variation emerged. These categories include: (a) transforming; (b) expanding; and (c) reifying teacher understanding and practice. The second theme concerned the wide variation between school sites with respect to their understanding and use of DD's design for reactive/corrective discipline. While the Pathways of Self-Control (or Doorways) were well understood and generally employed by SMS teachers, most JGMS teachers reported a lack of clear understanding and use of these strategies in their classroom management.

Moreover, three themes emerged with respect to factors identified by teachers that likely enabled and constrained the ways in which DD shaped teacher practice. These three themes included: (a) differences in school contexts (e.g., number of school initiatives); (b) teacher-level characteristics (e.g., experience, agreement with DD philosophy); and (c) habituated teacher practice. These three factors were corroborated in reports given by both school leaders and JGMS coaches.

Categories of Reported Change in Classroom Management Practice

There was wide variation among teachers and between school sites regarding the ways in which teachers reported how DD shaped (or failed to shape) their classroom management. While three of fourteen teachers explicitly stated that DD "transformed" their classroom management practice, the majority of teachers reported that it either reified or expanded their classroom management approach. Further, wide variation between these school sites' respective understandings and use of DD's approach to reactive (or corrective) discipline, namely, the Pathways of Self Control also surfaced in teacher reports.

Broad categorizations of DD's influence on teacher practice. As mentioned previously, three broad categories emerged regarding the ways in which DD was said to have influenced teachers' collective understandings and practices. These categories included: (a) transforming; (b) (selectively) expanding; and (c) reifying previously held notions and practice. In sum, DD's influence on teacher practice ranged from completely overhauling, to strengthening, to (merely) legitimating or validating previously held understandings and practices.

Transforming classroom management practice. Three teachers—varying from early career teacher to veteran—stated that DD1 (and in the case of the single SMS teacher, DD2 as well) transformed their classroom management practice. These three teachers considered DD their classroom management “system” in that each reported a high degree of alignment between DD's classroom management philosophy and (proactive and reactive) practices and their own as a result of DD1 (and DD2) training.

For example, one JGMS teacher described how her own classroom management practice (and classroom climate) was transformed as a result of DD training:

The classroom management I feel like I do that very close to what I was taught at the training...I went into the training with only a couple of years' experience in the classroom and didn't really have strategies for redirecting behavior...like that's not something you learn in undergrad. For me, going to this training was completely transformative...Like, “Oh my, gosh! There's this really great way to do things in my classroom! How has nobody ever told me this before?” Well the two years since then, my classroom has just functioned so much better.

Similarly, an SMS teacher described how DD gave her “a way to have my classroom managed” to the point where DD is now “second nature” in her classroom:

Especially as a new teacher, it really helped me just to think a little bit more about how I was approaching students, and it gave me a way to have my classroom managed because, as a new teacher, I didn't really have my own way, and I wasn't really set in my ways. It was nice to see how the classroom management system that DD has was working, and it helped me to visualize myself as using that system. Now, it's just second nature; I use it, and the kids know it, in my classroom.

Lastly, another JGMS teacher approaching retirement reported that DD transformed her classroom management approach from one based on teacher-control to one based on shared power and understanding of adolescent development and needs. JGMS's principal explicitly referred to this teacher's transformation as an example of the power of DD to transform teacher beliefs and practices.

Expanding existing knowledge and practice. Several teachers described DD, in varying ways and degrees, as adding to their existing knowledge and practice. Rather than DD transforming or simply reifying their current practice, these teachers described DD as selectively enhancing what they had already known and were able to do.

One JGMS teacher who stated that DD did not change her classroom management practice later reported that it made some of her existing practices—such as establishing classroom routines and modeling—more strategic and intentional. As an example, this teacher described how she began teaching classroom routines in the beginning of the year (rather than throughout the year as they were needed) and accompanied them with Y-charts:

I think the whole establishing of the routines part, being really purposeful at the beginning of the year and how we do every single movement in the classrooms, like if they're going from their desk with their chairs to the front of the room, or if we're doing book checkout kind of stuff, if we're going to do a partner activity, I, in the past, would kind of tackle those things as they came along the year, and now in the last couple of years I've really established that stuff very early on, before it comes to that point that we're going to do a group activity and this is how we do it, but visit all those things early in the year and then it's more of a refresher as those activities start to pop up. I remember going through the process of how what does it look like, sound like, feel like to do whatever the situation is. We have charts up in my room or at the beginning of the year and kind of establish that if we need to revisit it as the year goes on. I don't remember doing those things before.

As another example, an SMS teacher describes how DD helped make his current practice more consistent by providing him with a specific language to describe his existing practices and a coherent set of strategies to draw from, if and when needed:

I think it's changed because I've been able to explain what I do and describe what I do.

For me, that has helped me grow and be more consistent in what I've been doing versus:

“Okay that didn’t work. Okay, then. What’s going to work?... Well, we are going to try this over here; well, let’s try that over there; well, let’s try this over here.” Before you know it you are kind of lost in all these things and nothing stays consistent...DD has helped to kind of box it all in.

As both quotes above illustrate, DD added to these teachers’ existing approach to classroom management practice and in discrete ways (e.g., use of Y-charts and DD language).

Reifying existing beliefs and practice. The majority of teachers at both schools explicitly stated that DD did not change their classroom management. Rather, many of these teachers viewed DD as being part of their established philosophy and practice prior to DD training. Instead, in addition to (or in lieu of) expanding their current practice, DD’s influence was by way of reifying and legitimating their existing beliefs and practices. This reifying of previously established practices, can be seen in one SMS teacher’s description when she said:

I think it helped me identify some of the things that I have always done. Like I said, it just sounds like good teaching right? So when you are hearing about the disciplinary practices, it’s like “Oh, I do that...Oh, yeah, I do that too.” So, I think it ...gave me some kind of “Aha! So this is a good way to run things.” I think that is the thing that the DD provides. It reminds you that, "Hey, man, this is it. This is a really good approach and stay with that.”

Similarly, a JGMS teacher described DD as legitimating and validating his ‘natural’ approach to discipline as well as that of most of his teaching peers:

I think it lines up a lot with just who I am as a person, how I naturally discipline. So, I wouldn't say it changed. It gave me more confidence, a little more support that “Okay, this is okay!...I know that using Developmental Designs is relatively new to our building, but I feel like the philosophy and how we've been managing student behaviors really lined up with that. Maybe we all didn't have a more consistent way with the TAB or TAB Out or those kinds of systems, but I feel like it really hasn't changed. I feel like this was a building that already had some good practices, if that makes sense, with how we as a building handle discipline. Well, with exception of, a few strategies as result of DD.

Rather than changing their approach to classroom management, most teachers, such as the two featured above, described the influence of DD in the following ways: reminding them of good teaching practice; improving their understanding of adolescent development and needs;

making explicit what they knew (and practiced) intuitively; encouraging more consistency; giving them greater self-esteem/confidence vis-à-vis research to substantiate their current practice; and providing a shared vocabulary and language to describe practice.

Cross-comparison of school sites' use of DD's redirection strategies (The Pathways of Self-Control). Teachers at both JGMS and SMS were most knowledgeable and descriptive about DD's proactive (or preventative) approach to school discipline. They also reported that most aspects of DD philosophy and practices—such as modeling, establishing positive relationships with students, understanding adolescent development and meeting students' needs—were part of their classroom practice. However, there was wide variation in how teachers' reported understanding and using DD's approach to reactive (or corrective) discipline (i.e. redirections contained within The Pathways of Self-Control).

Although there was variation in how individual teachers reported using (or not using) DD-specific redirections, the biggest differences occurred between school sites. All five SMS teachers reported having a working knowledge of DD's classroom management practices and employing them in their classrooms (to varying degrees). For example, all SMS teachers referred to DD discipline practices such as noticing, redirections contained within The Pathways, and DD language (i.e. redirecting language) explicitly when describing their approach to classroom management. Moreover, and as previously described, four of these five teachers included visuals of The Doorways or other DD practices (e.g., types of DD language, noticing), with one teacher describing plans to revise the school-wide Think Sheet to include some, if not all, of DD's redirecting strategies.

In contrast to SMS teachers, the majority of JGMS teachers did not report employing many of the redirections contained within The Pathways of Self-Control (and DD language). The majority of JGMS teachers had difficulties relating their understanding and use of redirection strategies contained within The Pathways of Self-Control. With the exception of TAB and TAB Out, five of nine JGMS teachers could not name any other redirections. Additionally, several JGMS could not recall any aspect of DD language (e.g., directing, redirecting language) used to redirect student misbehavior. For instance, one JGMS teacher reported that while he was strongly committed to the relationship- and community-building aspects of DD, the same could not be said of DD's approach to corrective discipline. Below, he described how employing DD's specific redirection strategies was not something he placed much emphasis on:

None that I would use, or that I do use...I mean, it definitely made me realize that I'm probably on the opposite spectrum of how some of them should be used. I'm kind of opposite in terms of what's supposed to happen with DD. The community piece of it, like the idea that we are all together, I think that's the core of everything. If that's lacking, I think that's where the struggle comes in.

Another JGMS teacher, also strongly committed to the relational, communal, and preventative aspects of DD, was also unable to recall any DD redirections (outside of TAB and TAB-Out). She attributed her lack of recall to a general loss of momentum and focus on DD school-wide, following DD1 training: "It's escaping me what the parts are...It's been so long since we read it or we've had any kind of refresher on that, so it escapes me."

The Role of School Context in Enabling and Constraining DD Capabilities

The ways in which DD shaped or failed to shape teacher practice—both among individual teachers and between school sites—were influenced by two school-level characteristics. One characteristic involved differences in school leadership as it pertained to DD, specifically. Differences in school leadership—including the provision (or lack thereof) of administrator-driven supports previously discussed—influenced how teachers implemented DD at each site. Another characteristic is the extent to which the implementation of DD coincided with the implementation of other, major school initiatives. Whereas DD represented, up until the time of teacher interviews, the only major school-wide initiative at SMS, DD was one of several key initiatives at JGMS. At JGMS, the presence of competing school-wide initiatives had the effect of making DD more peripheral, while at SMS, the absence of competing initiatives made DD a more centralized school initiative.

School Leadership: Support and Accountability

Although not stated explicitly by teachers, the implementation of DD at each school was likely influenced, in part, by the decisions and actions (and inaction) of their respective school-level leaders. Two themes emerged regarding leadership support with respect to DD. One was the way in which school leaders privileged certain aspects of DD over others. Another theme involved the degree to which school leaders provided (or did not provide) direct guidance and direction for DD implementation, or guidance on explicit expectations for teachers to implement DD in their classroom management practices. Another theme involved the degree to which

school leaders provided explicit expectations and guidance around teachers' classroom use of DD.

In addition to the development of localized, administrator-driven supports of practice at SMS, both school leaders influenced DD implementation in their schools vis-à-vis the degree of emphases each placed on their respective teachers' use of certain aspects of DD (philosophy and/or core practices) over others. The ways in which teachers reported using DD in their classrooms post-DD1 training aligned closely with the aspects of DD their school leaders most emphasized.

Both school leaders emphasized four aspects of DD for school-wide implementation following DD1. These four aspects included: (1) DD's foundational knowledge (e.g., overarching philosophy, building relationships with students, meeting students' needs and depersonalizing misbehavior); (2) preventative or proactive classroom management practices (e.g. establishing and leveraging the social contract, (re)modeling, having classroom routines); (3) advisory; and (4) TAB and TAB-Out.⁵⁸ Based on teacher reports, these four aspects of DD were the most-widely understood, if not used, DD components.

Despite these commonalities, SMS and JGMS differed in the emphases that their respective school leaders placed on other DD practices as well as the emphases they placed on teachers' integrating DD throughout the school day (rather than simply morning advisory).

All five SMS teachers largely described DD practices that they successfully implemented (or at least attempted to implement) in their classrooms—such as noticing, redirecting language and DD redirections—as those that were also emphasized by their school leaders as school-wide practices. For instance, below, an SMS teacher describes how the school leader's ongoing emphasis on teachers using the above DD practices was critical to his own DD practice:

I think that's probably the strongest support I've received. I mean I think that it's always in their conversations with me. It's always in their conversations. It's a part of every one of our meetings. It's deliberate. The DD components are in all the way that we start every meeting: that's how we greet, that's how we meet, that's how we share. There's always helpful reminders—of some of the DD components—in what we could be doing and how

⁵⁸ Teachers reported advisory and TAB-TAB Out as the two singular practices that underwent the most drastic change post DD1 training. Although both schools had homeroom period prior to DD1 training, the purpose, content and routines included in it changed dramatically with implementation of advisory. Additionally, new structures were included for TAB-TAB Out including: designating a classroom spaces for TAB and TAB-Out (and materials) and partnering with teachers (whose respective rooms students would be tabbed-out to).

we can improve. Whether it be the student language, the pathways, there's always DD components and it's intentional. That's the one feeling I've always gotten is that from administration, "Hey, this is a program that we're vested in. It's here." They deliver that message routinely. Through meetings, through communications, through when they come to evaluate, from everything. It's something they're looking for.

For SMS teachers, the localized supports provided by SMS school leaders, in various forms, shaped their DD practice.

On the other hand, while several JGMS teachers reported that their principal was supportive of DD in many ways (e.g., being a vocally enthusiastic supporter of DD, setting aside money to purchase advisory supplies, using DD as a framework for designing staff meetings, including DD as an option in staff PD break-out sessions), they were still unclear about what her vision and expectations were for DD implementation. Teachers mentioned a lack of clarity with respect to both the use of DD's reactive/corrective management strategies and integrating DD into core content area classes (i.e. incorporating DD outside of advisory). As one JGMS teacher describes below:

Honestly, everything I've had exposure to is useful but, now that we're saying it, I wish ... If she is going to support us continuing DD full-on then, I would love it to have more ideas, more guidance, and more coaching like I said, more ways to implement within the classroom. If that's the way she wants to go, I want to go that way.

In particular, JGMS teachers reported a desire for their principal to provide more support in the form of increased "accountability." They expressed a desire for her to hold them and other teachers (especially those more resistant to DD's philosophy and practices) accountable for DD implementation. Examples of what constituted accountability in JGMS teachers' reports included integrating DD in administrative monitoring measures such as administrative walkthroughs (as their principal had during year one of implementation), teacher observational feedback and formal evaluations. On this point, JGMS's principal reported increasing DD monitoring and focusing on integrating DD throughout the school day as the intended goals for next school year. As the JGMS principal aptly stated in discussing such plans: "If I don't monitor it, it doesn't get done."

Periphery vs. Centrality: The Challenges of Competing School Initiatives

As a school initiative, DD entered different schooling contexts at JGMS and SMS. These schooling contexts differed not only with respect to the types of localized, school-based supports and differences in leadership practice concerning DD, but also in terms of the existence of other school initiatives. One theme that emerged was the way in which these two schools differed with respect to the breadth of other school initiatives and the perceived influence these had on developing capabilities for DD. In general, all teachers reported that school-wide focus on DD was waning (albeit to different degrees at each site). JGMS teachers attributed decreased focus on DD during the second year of implementation to the competing demands of existing initiatives (in addition to factors previously mentioned). Similarly, SMS teachers attributed waning school-wide focus on DD to plans underway to adopt a major school-wide program (International Baccalaureate).

Seven JGMS teachers reported that the school's focus ("momentum") on DD had waned during its second year of implementation. Although several teachers attributed this to the lack of ongoing DD training (i.e. the absence of DD2 and DD expert coaching), teachers also reported that it was also due to the demands of other initiatives. These initiatives competed for school and teacher resources such as staff meeting, professional development and teacher team time.

At JGMS, DD was the newest of five major curricular and school-wide initiatives.⁵⁹ All JGMS participants (principal, teachers, internal coaches) reported that these initiatives complimented one another and described several successful attempts to integrate them. However, JGMS teachers were also unanimous in reporting that there were "too many" school initiatives. As one teacher explained:

Overall, I think there are too many. I think we should try and focus either on literacy or behavior issues, but there seem to be so many [initiatives] out here. It's like, "Okay, what do you want me to really do?" ...Eventually, everything seems watered down. It's like, I can't do all this. I'm one person with supposedly eight hours a day. Do you want to know how many hours I work? Really? I don't think anybody does because I wouldn't be paid enough to do that."

Most JGMS teachers reported that the time they spent in staff meetings, professional development and team meetings were largely devoted to other initiatives and school-wide goals

⁵⁹ The major initiatives at JGMS include: Balanced Literacy (BL), Assessment for Learning (AFL), Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID), and Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Teaching (CLRT).

other than DD. For example, one teacher reported that, during the second year of DD implementation, more time was spent focusing on OVIAS, an anti-bullying program, than on DD (or any other school initiative). The heightened focus on OVIAS was in preparation for becoming an OVIAS demonstration school in the fall. In addition, and as previously mentioned, academic initiatives at JGMS (such as Balanced Literacy) were the primary focus of internal coaching work due, in part, to the large shifts in practice these initiatives required on behalf of teachers.

In contrast, at SMS, DD was the only major school-wide initiative for the first three years of implementation. Other school initiatives were comparatively much smaller in scope.⁶⁰ However, plans for the adoption of International Baccalaureate—to begin the fourth year of DD implementation—reportedly had a similar effect on the momentum and focus surrounding DD as reported above by JGMS teachers. For example, all SMS teachers reported that the recent adoption of IB shifted the focus from DD to planning for IB implementation. As one SMS teacher described:

This year, we're really focusing on IB, so we haven't really focused as much on the DD. I would say that the support is still there, but we probably haven't talked about it as much as we should, especially since we started IB because I feel like all of our staff meetings and PD is all about IB. I think we're expected to still use Developmental Designs in our classroom, but it's not talked about as much as it used to be.

The first year of IB adoption was scheduled for fall of the 2015-2016 school year, with planning for implementation beginning as early as the summer of 2014. During the summer of 2014, all 6th grade core content area teachers were required to reapply for hire as IB teachers, in preparation for the staggered grade-level roll out of IB. Reflecting on his experiences participating in the DD2 training (held summer 2014), one 6th grade teacher below describes how the anticipation of IB had an “overshadowing” affect, negatively impacting some teachers’ commitment and buy-in to DD:

I think that was the biggest thing I felt with DD2. That it was kind of maybe stagnant in the air because we were going through such a big change. I think... the whole IB and interviewing for jobs, I think that might have had a little bit of a role in it. I think we were

⁶⁰ Prior to DD adoption, SMS initiatives included Word Generation (an approach to teaching vocabulary in and across core content areas) and Reading Apprenticeship in ELA.

very well aware that things were changing and it was coming. There were so many other things going on. Even maybe in my own mind. I was wondering, “What’s going to happen?” which is why I don’t have really strong connections to it. So, I think last summer was that whole like things starting to shift. I think that is the only downer that I’ve ever felt with the DD. I’ve always enjoyed it. I’ve always appreciated both workshops.

Advocating for the continued use of DD, the SMS assistant principal and a teacher—both of whom were instrumental in SMS adopting DD—reported the need for district and school leaders to be strategic and explicit about how DD would fit within the IB design.

The Role of Teacher Characteristics in Enabling and Constraining DD Capabilities

As teachers (and school leaders and JGMS internal coaches) conveyed possible reasons for differences in how DD shaped (or failed to shape) teacher practice, several themes emerged. These themes largely pointed to factors outside of the quality of supports of practice (provided either by DD or localized, school-based supports) and pointed, instead, to teacher-level characteristics and the inherent challenge in changing deeply habituated practices. These characteristics included: (a) teacher personality (i.e. style, mindset) and (b) regression to past practice. Participants reported that these characteristics (particularly the former) as the major impediment to building school-wide capabilities for DD practice. Both themes emerged at both school sites but were much more strongly emphasized by JGMS’s teachers and school leader.

Teacher “Personality,” “Mindset,” and/or “Style”

All participants referred to teacher-level attributes such as “personality,” “mindset,” and/or “style” in describing key teacher characteristics that supported and constrained the development of capabilities for DD practice, including but not limited to DD’s approach to classroom management. The majority of teachers described DD in terms of being “a natural fit” and strongly aligning with how they previously managed their classroom. Yet these teachers, as well as their school leaders and coaches, also reported that DD represented a drastic shift in philosophy and practice for several of their school colleagues.

One way the majority of teachers described the shift in practice required by DD was in terms of “old vs. new.” “Old vs. new” referred both to generally held educational beliefs and approaches and classroom management philosophy. More to the point, for teachers for which

DD was not a “natural fit,” developing capabilities for DD practice was constrained by their willingness and ability to make these necessary shifts in mindset, philosophy, and belief.

“Old vs. new school”. Several teachers at both schools—but particularly at JGMS—described enablers and impediments to DD practice in terms of what one JGMS teacher described as “old vs. new school” educational mindset, beliefs, and philosophy. Often, when teachers discussed this dichotomy, it was tied to years of teaching experience; that is, teachers nearing retirement were thought to struggle more with DD due to holding regressive education beliefs and approaches. As aptly stated by one SMS teacher:

I’ve seen some of my colleagues who’ve been teaching for 20-30 years, it’s hard for them to be in that place. I think it’s still very kind of old school if you will, you sit down, you be quiet, here’s the curriculum and ‘boom!’ So how to get to a social emotional place of understanding—where the brain is, what the kids needs are, especially a 21st century learner, where they are in this space and where society has them and undertaking this bigger picture—that is a hard place for some of my colleagues to go. I think it’s uncomfortable for them to be there. DD is asking you to step out of that comfort zone—don’t take it personally, let’s get some new language and a way to understand this, how to talk to parents how to talk to kids—understand these social-emotional things about every kid, and come to a better place as an educator, as a practitioner. It is hard for people to get there....Does that make sense?

Another SMS teacher echoed these sentiments: “It’s not really about the training. It’s more about the teachers’ *reaction* to the training. Some of the older teachers’ reaction to the training, I didn’t like. I feel they should have been more open-minded about it” (original emphasis).

At JGMS, older teachers were reported to be more cynical about DD as yet another initiative that would eventually fade away or be replaced in the near future. They were also viewed as those who had the most difficulty in grappling with the school’s drastically changing student demographics (i.e. more ELL, immigrant, non-white and free or reduced lunch students). One JGMS teacher in her 5th year of teaching described JGMS’s shifts in student population as changes more experienced teachers had yet to adjust to:

James Garfield has changed dramatically even since the time I started here five years ago. We have a much higher percentage of students living in poverty, students with free and reduced lunch, we have a much higher percentage of ELL students, English Language

Learners, we have a higher percentage of minority students and I think for some teachers, especially older teachers who have been here and were here when this was a mostly middle income white school, it's not like that anymore. And it's hard to change and I understand that but I think that's where a lot of the resistance comes from.

Two JGMS teachers, including one below, also described teachers who failed to embrace DD (or struggled with it) in terms of their inability to grapple with the changes that had taken place since they first began teaching:

I think in our building there's definitely a gap between those of us that are pushing the envelope on where we're going with it, and those that are 1960s, and you guys [Origins] are going to fight the teachers that are 1960s.

School leaders at both schools echoed the above sentiments as they also viewed DD teachers' struggles and successes with implementing DD's classroom management philosophy and practices explicitly and primarily through the lens of teacher mindset (rather than training quality, frequency, coaching supports, etc.).

Classroom management philosophy.⁶¹ Another sub-theme found in teacher reports, particularly at SMS, were the ways in which teachers' previously held classroom management philosophy and beliefs, in particular, supported and constrained building capabilities for DD practice, post DD1 training. As one new teacher highly committed to DD reported: "I think it was easier for me just because I was a brand new teacher and so I didn't really have any style or anything like when I started so I just kind of like picked this up and it worked."

All five SMS teachers (and the school leader) reported that DD's approach to classroom management was a source of confusion and tension among staff. At the center of this tension were misunderstandings of DD's approach to discipline as well as expectations some teachers had for a more traditional management system than the DD approach provided. As previously reported, many SMS teachers desired a discipline approach that was explicit, sequential and progressive especially when it came to correcting misbehavior. According to one SMS teacher,

⁶¹ This is especially the case with respect to corrective/reactive discipline as this aspect of DD was identified as the most drastic shift in management beliefs, philosophy and practice. DD leaders and teachers described how teacher beliefs concerning discipline, caused them to wrongfully employ DD structures and strategies. For instance, TAB and TAB-Out, corrective strategies meant to help students reflect and restore self-control before rejoining the classroom community, were often used as punitive timeouts and began to be viewed by students as such.

where some teachers superimposed this traditional understanding of corrective discipline onto The Pathways, others resisted the new approach:

Specifically the biggest issue I know my colleagues had was that they were looking for a structured form. I think that was the hardest thing for them to implement because they weren't getting what they wanted. And when you don't agree to what you want, you sometimes close your mind off to the idea that these are really good practices that you can use within your classroom.

We had a lot of teachers who did not really want to do that because they had their own way of classroom management, so it was almost an argument between the staff and how we were going to implement it and if we were going to implement it. I know some teachers didn't, right away. I was a new teacher, so I was right on board, and I was like, "This is great!"

As reported previously, the DD2 facilitator dedicated a large portion of workshop to clarifying DD's approach to discipline and implementation of The Pathways of Self-Control.

Furthermore, teachers who considered DD a "natural fit" for them strongly emphasized the importance of teacher mindsets as both a prerequisite and outcome of developing capabilities for DD practice. As aptly explained by one SMS teacher:

I think if a teacher can get to a space, a comfort level within themselves on: "This is how I'm going to do things now."... Like for me, when I said I'm not going to raise my voice to anybody anymore. That was my own personal thing. I then allowed myself to be okay with using directing language, using procedures and norms to govern how I do things versus having a mindset of "I'm the teacher, you are the student. Sit down. This is what you need to do?"... You see? It's two different mindsets. How you see things, how you view things. So for me that's a mindset and for me that's what DD does for you; it puts you in another mindset where you can start problem solving and really start being a practitioner.

Likewise, another JGMS teacher for whom DD was a natural fit also described the demands DD places on teacher mindset, specifically, as it relates to (restraining) teacher-control:

You definitely have to relinquish some of that control, but I just think that it's a mindset change... The other 7th grade teacher, she's definitely hesitant to try some of that stuff

throughout the day but she does it sometimes and it always goes relatively well for her, but I think for the other ones it's just "that's not my style, so I'm not doing that."

Not all teachers who considered DD a natural fit used all components of DD. A few teachers at both schools considered DD a natural fit and part of their existing practice yet also stated that they did not use certain DD practice in part because some DD practices were not in alignment with their approach to discipline. Due to the need for students to leave the classroom and enter another colleague's classroom, TAB-Out was among the practices these teachers reported did not align with their approach to discipline. Two JGMS teachers who also reported rarely or never using TAB-Out described it as not part of their "personality," and, instead, elected to "put out fires differently." A teacher who was instrumental in bringing DD to SMS (and putting on informal DD trainings for new staff and teaching interns) stated, "I tried TAB-Out the first year we tried to roll it out and it just didn't feel right. It just didn't feel right."

Regression to Past Practice

In addition to teacher mindset (e.g., style, personality, philosophy, beliefs), teachers reported that capabilities for DD practice were constrained by a return to habituated practice. This was especially the case with respect to capabilities for DD's approach to classroom management practice.

For instance, three teachers below describe regression to past practice as a process of high commitment to DD philosophy and core practices followed by "falling back" to well-established practices, especially during difficult times:

I think that's really all it is and overcoming some of...like I even do that sometimes. I fall back into comfort zones. You fall back on language or words you've always used or things that you've done just out of human nature, rather than challenge yourself to step out of it. I think that's probably the biggest thing. It's remembering to incorporate it in, embed it in.

People buy into it, everybody does, but to a degree. I think sometimes when the pavement hits the rock and times get a little tough and kids are a little anxious and unruly, then I think some of my colleagues aren't as...they don't stick to it. They don't follow that plan.

I feel like we all have our bad habits that we've created over the years...Yea, more training is needed...I think we kind of resort back to what we naturally have learned. Like who we are...You...can still sometimes do something and go, "okay that wasn't the best teaching practice," but you have this habit. That's hard.

A few teachers described DD as easier to sustain when learning as a new teacher and regression to past practice as more likely for veteran teachers. For example, one new SMS teacher described more veteran teachers as particularly susceptible to falling back on old practices: "I think it would be very hard as a teacher, who has been teaching for a while, to try to change up what you're doing. If you're in the same classroom and the same building, you fall back into old habits." Another JGMS teacher described the fact that she was a new teacher as an asset to learning and implementing DD:

I think in that sense like I'm sure that they have it in their heads and they were at the training and they learned everything but it's hard to hear and then do it. They know what to do but it's hard to just automatically do it. I think it's definitely a process. I think it was easier for me just because I was a brand new teacher and so I didn't really have any style or anything like when I started so I just kind of like picked this up and it worked.

Even for new teachers, the need to make DD habitual through repeated use of its practices was reported. For example, one JGMS teacher stated: "...a lot of times I do use [DD redirections], but it still takes practice. You have to get into that habit of doing it. If not, you're not going to think to yourself, "which doorway should I use?" every time."

Regression to past practice was more strongly emphasized by JGMS participants. In addition to the factors described above, teacher comments suggest that regression to past practice was also due in part to the "tough clientele," consisting of a small but significant population of chronically behaviorally challenged students.. As two teachers reported below:

I think teachers just fall into their old routines and especially in the second year not having had that refresher training at the forefront the people started to go back to their old ways with stuff. I think we also have a very tough clientele and they're not receptive to a lot of the management stuff either.

We have kids that come to the building and just not embracing the culture of DD. We had last year alone 200 plus new kids. They come from rough types of neighborhoods; they

come from places that they didn't know what we're talking about. Then to retrain them...it takes a couple of years for the process to really get going and so then you have all these new kids every year and I think teachers had struggled with the kids that get it, the kids that don't and then to make it work. And, then you fall back on what you used to do because it's just easier, but not necessarily effective. I think the self-control stuff starts off really strong at the beginning of the year and then it kind goes away. So that's the hard part.

Teachers and both JGMS coaches reported that, for the challenging students, the DD design for classroom management was insufficient.

Discussion

I began asking teachers their perspectives on externally provided supports of practice and the ways these supports shaped (or failed) to shape their practice. Yet, my analysis of teacher interviews yielded findings that complicated the narrative leading to my research question.

For instance, one unexpected finding was that both external and internal coaching were not nearly as valued by teachers (with respect to developing DD capabilities for practice) as what the implementation literature suggests. Another somewhat related finding was that following DD1 training teachers (and school leaders and coaches as well) placed high value on supports that emerged *within* their respective schools rather than on externally provided, DD supports.

Furthermore, factors outside of the direct control influence of DD—such as teacher- and school-level characteristics—were found to heavily influence teacher- and school-level DD practice. Relatedly, another unexpected finding was the wide variation in how JGMS and SMS teachers understood and leveraged DD's approach to classroom management particularly, despite both schools being considered highly committed to DD. Teacher survey data did not point to significant differences among teachers with respect to teaching beliefs, efficacy or teaching practices. This is in contrast to teacher interview data where sharp differences among teachers did emerge.

CHAPTER VII
FINDINGS:
THE VIEW FROM THE TOP: DD LEADERS' PERCEPTIONS OF CHALLENGES TO
DEVELOPING DD CAPABILITIES

Introduction

The previous chapters described: (a) DD's design for classroom management and the constituent capabilities for practice it required; (b) the formal and social supports of practice used to develop these capabilities and interdependencies (or lack thereof) between them; and, (c) teachers' perceptions of the usefulness of these (and other) supports, the ways in which DD shaped (or failed to shape) their practice, and local factors that enabled and constrained the development of DD capabilities.

This chapter addresses the final research question: *What are DD leaders' perceptions regarding the types of challenges constraining the development of ongoing capabilities for DD practice in DD-trained schools?* By "DD leaders", I mean staff members currently working at Origins who are principally responsible for the design of DD supports and developing teachers' initial and ongoing capabilities for DD practice. With this question, my aim is to understand the factors that have enabled and constrained the development of DD capabilities on a broader scale than that afforded by the school sites (2), teachers (14), internal coaches (2), and school-leaders (2) included in this study. Gaining the perspectives of DD leaders engaged in the work of developing capabilities for DD practice—DD coaches, consultants, workshop facilitators and positional leaders in Origins—in schools and districts across the country situates findings from the first three research questions in a wider context.

To answer this question, I analyzed transcripts from two semi-structured interviews with three DD leaders concerning their work as DD workshop facilitators, expert DD coaches, and consultants in schools and districts across the country over the span of more than a decade.

My answer to this question is as follows. DD leaders identified five challenges emanating from within schools and their environments that constrained their ability to develop capabilities for DD practice. These five challenges included: (a) partial implementation of DD's full

complement of formal and social supports of practice; (b) “implementation fatigue;” (c) school officials minimizing the drastic change in practice DD requires; (d) shifts (and decreases) in educational funding and focus areas; and (e) shifts from external coaching (i.e. DD expert coaching) to internal coaching (i.e. peer coaching). The growing rarities of on-site coaching attenuated ongoing partnerships between schools and Origins, the provider of DD (i.e. DD literature, expert coaches, workshop facilitators, consultants, etc.). DD leaders viewed partial implementation of DD’s formal and social supports of practice as both a singular challenge and as mutually interdependent with the other four identified challenges.

Below, I break findings down into three major sections. The first section describes the challenges emanating from schools and their environments (i.e. the five factors constraining the development of capabilities). The second section describes the causes and impact of the sharp decrease of DD on-site (expert) coaching and ongoing partnerships with schools. The third section describes the internal instability, adaptations, and dilemmas facing Origins as an organization and the attempts it has made to contend with shifts occurring within DD schools and the broader schooling environment.

Challenges Emanating from Schools and Their Environments

All DD leaders described challenges emanating from within schools and their environments that negatively impacted their work with schools (and teachers) as well as implementation of the DD approach. These factors included: (a) partial implementation of DD’s full complement of formal and social supports of practice; (b) “implementation fatigue”; (c) minimizing the drastic change in practice DD requires; (d) shifts in educational funding and focus areas; and (e) shifts from external (i.e. DD expert coaching) to internal (i.e. peer coaching).

Partial Implementation of the Full Complement of DD Supports

All DD leaders described partial implementation of the DD approach as an impediment to developing practice capabilities and sustaining the approach in schools. Although partial implementation of DD included selective use of the ten core practices, DD leaders most heavily emphasized partial implementation of DD’s social supports of practice as a critical obstacle to their work. DD leaders reported that as few as 10% of DD1-trained districts and schools contract for the DD2 workshop. DD1 leaders emphasized that in addition to revisiting, extending, and troubleshooting DD1 implementation, the DD2 workshop training was important due to the relationship between instructional quality and classroom management. As a result, DD leaders,

such as the one below, reported that the low percentage of schools taking DD2 likely had negative consequences for schools and teachers:

They're not completing the Developmental Designs training. Developmental Designs is not, "I take half of it and I'm done." I stop with half the tools or, at most, two thirds of the approach. It's an approach, an entire approach. So, if you're not completing the approach, then you don't have all the tools that you could have to impact your classroom. In addition to DD2, many schools and districts did not participate in all, or sometimes any, of the follow-up workshops. Most important to DD leaders, was that even fewer teachers received DD expert coaching supports.

Although partial implementation of DD's formal and social supports of practice was noted as an issue in and of itself, the issues described below were viewed as contributing factors.

Shifts in Educational Imperatives and Funding

All DD leaders described changes in educational funding and focus areas in the last decade as impediments to their work. Drastic cuts in educational spending resulting from the 2007-2008 economic recession coupled with an increased focus on academics were cited as explanations for partial implementation of DD's approach.

These shifts made the costs (and time commitment) of ongoing support (multiple DD1 workshops for new teachers, DD2, follow-up workshops, coaching, etc.) prohibitive for many schools and districts. This was particularly the case for DD expert coaching, as the costs of providing for DD expert coaches' travel and lodging often made this support cost prohibitive for many schools and districts. As a result, these shifts were also described as constraints on the organization's ability to establish long-term partnerships with schools (and districts). DD leaders, such as the one below, reported that the 2007 economic recession had a profoundly negative effect on the amount of coaching support they provided to DD-trained schools and districts:

When we first came on board we had a lot of coaching going on. It was pretty good. We had some who were full-time...They would be out in schools 80 days a year, not the same school, but they were fully employed doing this coaching piece. A lot of schools took coaching on. That's eight years ago. The world has changed a lot...At that time, money got really, really tight...We saw a decline in the coaching.

Prior to the 2007 economic recession, DD leaders reported coaching at least two days per month in most of their schools. After the recession, DD leaders reported that most schools might contract for two coaching days per year.

In addition to the economic recession, DD leaders reported a change in school regulatory and funding environments, vis-à-vis the increased focus on academic content and outcomes. A DD leader explained how increased focus on academics coupled with less funding made SEL programs such as DD “a hard sell”:

As society or the government is putting more initiatives on schools for performance, particularly with Common Core and other academic kinds of initiatives, a lot of the money is going there. It's still a hard sell, like the arts, social-emotional learning and how it impacts children and schools is a hard sell.

According to DD leaders, the increased focus on academics at the national and state levels, and prescribed or adopted curricula, helped to explain the low ratio of schools that take DD2. Instead, schools and districts looked to DD to help them with advisory and classroom discipline, both aspects of which are covered in DD1.

Furthermore, DD leaders described other changes in educational environments --such as modifications made to funding structures -- that also made DD expert coaching less feasible. According to one DD leader, “money flow changed as well, moving from the hands of the teacher to the principal and then to the district.” This change meant that decisions about professional development were more often concentrated in the hands of district administrators tasked with improving test scores and responding to federal mandates (e.g., No Child Left Behind; Common Core) not directly related to SEL.

Implementation Fatigue

DD leaders ascribed partial implementation of DD on behalf of schools and teachers to “implementation fatigue.” Implementation fatigue was described as an issue facing K-12 schools generally but particularly in challenged school settings. DD leaders used the phrase “implementation fatigue” to capture several synchronous educational issues. Key among these issues was the adoption of too many initiatives coupled with too little time and money for the professional development needed to make them a success. One DD leader implied that the prevalence of multiple, competing initiatives made engendering teacher commitment and sustaining long-term partnerships difficult:

The problem with education right now is one of implementation fatigue. We're asking teachers to do too much too fast and too often. Teachers are willing to make changes, but they're not going to make changes every single year. So, if we're going to do DD then by golly stick with it...I always tell my group, "I never say "goodbye," I say, "see you later," because it has to be "see you later" if we're going to be successful with this work.

Additionally, DD leaders described implementation fatigue as a factor contributing to schools' and principals' tendencies to minimize the demands required to build capabilities and change teachers' practice.

Minimizing the Shift in Classroom Management Practice DD Requires

As previously mentioned, DD's approach to classroom management was considered by DD leaders to be a more drastic shift in practice than its approach to classroom instruction. According to DD leaders, the real challenge, however, was that school leaders did not have an adequate understanding and appreciation for the magnitude of this change:

I think aside from the fact that they just do the training and say they're done, it's that they don't understand how significant the change is, and how they have to continue to work for years. I think that would be the biggest thing: for them to understand how different this is for teachers, particularly when it comes to managing kids in their classroom. For some districts, the whole thing about engaging students in curriculum, that's what they do. They know. They've studied that. That's not so significant. What's really significant in most every district, like I say, is 100 percent of schools manage their kids through punishment and rewards. It's teacher control. To change that model to student control is significant and I don't know that schools and districts and principals and leadership realize just how significant that is.

As these comments imply, DD leaders attributed school officials' minimizing the shift in practice that DD's approach to classroom management requires to the partial uptake of DD's social supports and the absence of ongoing partnerships between Origins and DD-trained schools.

Shift From DD Expert Coaching to Internal (Peer) Coaching

Although peer coaches are integral to increasing fidelity of implementation and sustainability of the DD approach, one DD leader described the recent increase in district- and

school-level coaches across the country as an obstacle to these very things.⁶² Two drawbacks were associated with the increase in internal coaches. These drawbacks relate to the training of internal coaches and the work constraints they face due to being school employees (including serving as part-time teachers).

DD leaders reported that schools and districts described a drastic increase in district-level and school-level coaches across the country. On one hand, DD leaders attributed the growth in the number of internal coaches to school officials' recognizing the criticality of improving classroom practice and the central role of coaching in this endeavor. On the other hand, DD leaders also pointed to several drawbacks associated with the increase in internal coaches and the ways it negatively impacted efforts to develop DD capabilities.

One key drawback was the use of internal coaches who had not been trained in DD's peer coaching model. DD's peer coaching model requires that potential coaches first receive expert coaching and demonstrate proficient implementation in all ten core practices described in Chapter Four. Only after being trained in, and coached to, fidelity in each of DD's core practices were potential peer coaches allowed to participate in DD's peer-coaching workshop to learn coaching-specific skills. However, DD leaders stated that many internal coaches used in DD-trained districts and schools had not participated in DD training nor had they received DD expert coaching. Below, one DD leader described how, despite expert DD coaching being offered to schools—including the three MN schools included in the Jagers & Kwame-Ross (2013) study—one school discontinued this service in preference of using its own internal coaches:

Even with this study, we started going in as expert coaches and that's what we wanted to do for the three years. After maybe the first year or so they decided they wanted their in-house coaches to be DD coaches. We didn't actually train those in-house DD coaches. They didn't take the DD coaching workshop. I'm sure they're fine coaches, but they didn't go through our model of coaching. It's a frustration for us because we're seeing less coaching, yet it's a great thing for schools in general because schools have more coaches than ever. They've realized the power of coaching and coaches. So, we haven't figured out, not well at least, how to effectively handle that.

⁶² Peer coach, district- and school-level coach, and internal coach are used interchangeably as each refers to a coach that is employed by a local educational authority (ISD, school, district) rather than an external organization or partner (e.g., Origins).

All DD leaders expressed the challenge of grappling with the drastic decrease of expert DD coaching services, both in terms of its economic impact on Origins as a whole and on DD program fidelity.

Likewise, another drawback in the increase of internal coaches concerned the nature of internal and external coaching themselves; specifically, the limitations of internal coaching. A DD leader explains important distinctions between internal and external coaching including the coaching modalities employed by each:

The biggest difference is, teachers, if they have a union, they can't actually offer advice to another teacher. You have to coach them through reflective questioning. Me being an outsider, I can say, "You know what? Here's what you should do." I have a different approach. I think districts and teachers expect more of that from me. "He's the expert, he should know."... Teachers can't offer advice. Only a principal can do that. Whereas, I, as an expert, come and say, "You know what? Here's what." I can do that because I'm an outsider. So, it's very different. It has to be a different approach. I'm not their peer. I'm not a colleague. There's a whole different relational issue when you have a colleague, another teacher, coaching a teacher.

Furthermore, this same DD leader described how teachers prefer the direct advising approach used by external, DD coaches rather than the reflective questioning approach used by many internal coaches:

And truthfully, they want us to do that. They don't want us to help them reflect through something. They say, "We've done that before." In fact, our first e-coaching model was one of a more reflective, constructive nature and teachers were like, "What are you talking about? Help me figure out what I need to do better." So we've pulled away from that approach a little bit and have gone more of the direct advice approach instead of constantly asking questions. We do plenty of that but expert coach is a little bit different role.

DD leaders, such as the one above, tempered their support of internal coaching with the caveat that the limitations often placed on internal coaches had a limiting affect on the impact they were able to make in developing teachers' DD capabilities.

DD Expert Coaching and Ongoing Partnerships with Schools: Growing Rarities

The scenario above implicitly points to what DD leaders explicitly stated: that DD expert coaching was an all but defunct social support of practice. All three DD leaders described DD expert coaching as the most critical support of practice following DD1 workshop training. They considered coaching to be critical to high-fidelity implementation of DD practices and structures and long-term sustainability of the approach. However, all models of DD expert coaching—expert (face-to-face, e-coaching), peer coaching and self-coaching—are either underutilized or suffer from design challenges.

DD Expert Coaching

DD leaders described DD expert coaching as their most underutilized support of practice. One DD leader aptly described the growing absence of DD expert coaching and its impact on implementation:

I think the biggest challenge that I see is being able to go in do coaching and consulting after training. I know it's a financial burden for schools...It's usually they come to a workshop, get trained and they're done. We know that good staff development, if we really want it to be successful, has to be followed up with some coaching or some consulting to help to make sure that things are implemented correctly. I think that's the biggest challenge that we face is that schools are just sending teachers and getting them trained and then going back and trying to implement to fidelity. We know very, very well that's not happening.

DD leaders reported that they did less coaching than they had ever done. Specifically, this included face-to-face coaching and peer coaching (which also requires some face-to-face, expert coaching).

In part due to the lack of schools investing in DD expert coaching, most schools failed to develop a core group of high-fidelity implementers, peer coaches and model classrooms. Below, a DD leader describes how factors, such as funding decreases and lack of time in schools, prohibited expert coaching from being an effective support in developing DD capabilities:

The core team....We don't get enough time anymore....seven, eight years ago, we would get 8-10 days of coaching in schools, but the money changed and shifted so we don't get that much time anymore. So, the whole idea of a core group is really, really effective, but it's still hard to do because we can't get in schools long enough.

Importantly, as this quote and others have pointed to, the decrease in expert DD coaching had wide-ranging negative impacts. As previously mentioned, it negatively impacted Origins' bottom line DD program fidelity but also attenuated important aspects of DD's approach to developing capabilities (e.g., developing a core team of high-implementing teachers and model classrooms).

Moreover, DD leaders also reported that their attempt to make coaching cheaper and more convenient vis-à-vis e-coaching and the *Self-coaching Guide* have yet to be successful approaches to developing capabilities. Whereas e-coaching is a very recently launched coaching model that may be in need of additional marketing and advertising, DD leaders report that the *Self-coaching Guide* is ineffective as originally designed:

What I'm finding is that it's too complicated for that though (to be used alone). That you need someone to facilitate you through it...It's a little too in-depth and cumbersome, I think, as it stands, for teachers to make much headway on their own. What I've experienced is giving it to a teacher is not effective. Very few teachers are going to read through this and go through all the work it takes to cipher their practice.

In subsequent sections, DD leaders' describe the ways in which they attempted to repurpose the *Self-coaching Guide* in response to these findings.

Ongoing Partnerships With Schools

DD expert coaching was described as the strongest link between DD-trained schools and teachers. The drastic reduction in DD expert coaching, then, resulted in a commensurate decrease in ongoing partnerships between Origins and schools following DD1 training. DD leaders reported that the lack of ongoing partnerships between Origins and DD-trained schools was largely due to the minimization of the drastic change in practice DD's approach required, competing demands and the need to build internal capacity and long-term sustainability. Nonetheless, some schools did continue to partner with Origins and maintained these partnerships over time, such as the one school described by a DD leader below:

The most successful schools that do our work keep at it. It's like this one school in St. Paul. They've been doing this work for 10 years and we're back again for a day or two, for maintenance, "I think we're slipping here. We need some help here. We're always around the edge of that school supporting them and that's how you make effective implementation. That's not just with DD but with anything.

Long-term partnerships between DD and schools, such as that described above, were outliers rather than the norm. DD leaders reported that customizing resources, packaging supports, developing cheaper and more convenient coaching supports, and more aggressively pursuing and marketing to previously trained schools and districts were strategies they were using to redress the issues contributing to weakening partnerships.

Internal Instability, Adaptation, and Unanswered Questions

All three DD leaders described Origins as an organization undergoing drastic internal changes. These changes included leadership changes, organizational restructuring (including the resurgence of a competitor) and, drastic shifts in their work resulting from changes in educational environments over the last decade. In the midst of these challenges, DD leaders also counted as success their ability to adapt to these challenges and the continuation of their work in schools and districts.

A “Tumultuous Year”

During the interviewing period, Origins had just entered a period of drastic downsizing and restructuring. Staffing at Origins had been cut in half (from 20 to 11 members). In addition to staffing cuts, Origins had had three Executive Directors in less than a year. Those staff members who remained, including the three included in this study (one of which served as interim executive director), had to absorb new roles and responsibilities, some of which they had no previous experience with. A DD leader describes the magnitude of internal changes facing Origins and retained staff:

As an organization, one thing my co-director and I have been dealing with a lot is how do you run an organization, when half the people are gone? Our publishing department, our marketing department, those don't exist anymore. How do we get blogs out? How do we maintain what we need to publish? How do we market, when we don't have any marketing professionals? We have been working hard to re-train ourselves, not just the other co-director and I, but the whole organization, into stepping up to doing those things that we know we need to do.

DD leaders attributed the internal flux facing Origins to a multitude of things: “It's the size of Origins, it's the funding, it's the management. There were political aspects to this as well. I think it was a perfect storm of a lot of things.”

Obsolescence of Implementation Frameworks: Indirect Effects of Reduced Coaching Role

The underutilization of DD expert coaching supports had adverse effects on DD's work within schools, but also had an important organizational consequence. The underutilization of expert coaching led to the discontinued use of implementation fidelity templates and frameworks to drive the work of the organization. DD leaders described the contents of these frameworks as very detailed, including observable school-wide and classroom-level performance expectations for each of the 10 core practices over a span of three years. However, DD leaders reported no longer using or circulating implementation frameworks due to the lack of time they spent in schools:

We use to have this template. For instance, we know that you're in stage one as a DD school if these things are there. We've written that template and we have it...but because we don't spend much time in schools anymore, it seems that we haven't done much with that template in years. Because we do so little coaching, we haven't updated them...because we never get six to eight days to go and see what's happening. We just don't get that time anymore.

One DD leader suggested that the implementation frameworks may be better used at the district and school level to guide implementation: "It might be wise of us to do that anyhow and support principals in how to use something like that."

"We Need to Change": Designing, Redesigning and Repurposing Supports

DD leaders also described their ongoing work as an attempt to evolve in response to environmental factors as well as with their realizations of the affordances and limitations of DD supports. These changes included packaging supports to make ongoing support (i.e. coaching and follow-up workshops) more economically feasible for schools; developing more cost-effective coaching models (i.e. e-coaching and self-coaching); and leveraging the *Self-coaching Guide* in ways more beneficial to DD coaches, internal coaches and principals.

Packaging supports. One significant change DD made in the way they attempt to support schools and teachers was in creating a packaged set of supports. Recognizing the need for both the initial and follow-up training along with coaching, DD created a package set of supports to incorporate these important necessities. The packaged set of supports included one of the weeklong workshops (DD1, DD2), a resource library, and two implementation support days.

The resource library includes: the DD1 (or DD2) Resource Book, The Advisory Book and Advisory Book Study Guide for up to 30 workshop participants; five copies of selected

commercial publications including *Classroom Discipline*; and the two DVDs that accompany The Advisory Book and *Classroom Discipline*. Implementation support days include covered costs for a DD consultant to travel to a school or district. These two days can be used flexibly; that is, they can include a combination of coaching (face-to-face or e-coaching), follow-up workshops and consulting. DD leaders reported it as difficult to get schools to take advantage of the implementation support days even though they had paid for them. They attributed this reluctance to the difficulty schools and districts had in dedicating two staff development days to DD—of what was often a total of only three or four days in an entire school calendar—especially when DD was only one of several school initiatives.

Notwithstanding, the packaged set of supports served two purposes. First, it provided schools and teachers with an array of resources at discounted costs. Second, it increased the likelihood that schools and teachers would be provided with a combination of DD expert coaching, follow-up workshops, and consultation following DD1 (or DD2) workshop training.

Designing cheaper coaching supports. DD leaders reported that one way they attempted to evolve their coaching supports to meet the financial and time constraints of schools was to create cheaper, more accessible coaching options. Below, a DD leader reflected on the thought process behind the fairly recent development of both the *Self-coaching Guide* and the e-coaching model:

For years, I've been the coach, I walk in, I look at the teacher's classroom and give them some feedback and I go away. Maybe I'll come back two or three times, but we realized, we can't actually change practice with those few visits. We've been working on this whole idea of self-coaching where we developed the *Self-coaching Guide* and we've used it a little within its infancy, this idea of video-coaching. I think the e-coaching that we're putting out there now as an option is a viable, cheap option so you can get coaching without having to pay travel and you can get more teachers coached that way. So, I think that is a huge piece as well as the *Self-Coaching Guide*.

E-coaching and the *Self-Coaching Guide* helped Origins redress the financial burden of face-to-face coaching (travel, lodging, meals), limited amount of coaching included in packaged supports and the difficulty of maintaining and extending partnerships with DD-trained schools.

Repurposing the Self-Coaching Guide. DD leaders described the *Self-Coaching Guide* as an evolving support of practice whose most effective use(s) were currently being determined.

As previously stated, DD leaders found the original purpose for which the guide was designed—enabling teachers to assess, evaluate, and improve their practice absent expert coaching—ineffective. Instead, they described the *Self-coaching Guide* as a work in progress, currently undergoing revisions to support new uses in preparation for republication.

When used by teachers, DD leaders described the *Self-Coaching Guide* as best used in conjunction with other coaching supports. Additionally, DD leaders reported that the guide should be used not just by teachers, but by anyone charged with assisting teachers in developing their capabilities for DD practice (i.e. DD coaches, peer coaches, principals).

Below, one DD leader describes the expanded use of the *Self-Coaching Guide* as an implementation framework used to support coaches (and principals) in observing, evaluating and providing feedback:

The *Self-Coaching Guide* is what really brought a lot of things together for us because it made us sit down and see “so what are the exact things that we need for fidelity?”

They’re very observable practices. You can say, “When you do this, that’s when fidelity is there.” The coach can say, “Yes. When you redirected, the tone was neutral, body language is neutral and you told the student what to do rather than what not to do. Those are three examples of very specific, observable outcomes of fidelity in practice. As a coach, it’s a nice thing to have too, because as coaches, we all know now we’ve agreed on what are the observable practices that we need to see to reach fidelity.

Another DD leader described plans to use the guide in conjunction with the e-coaching model:

We’ve been working with that [video-coaching] and trying to use the self-coaching guide in conjunction through videos in their classrooms... We’re going to work some more with some teachers in Madison that we’re starting on a pilot with. That’s been a real significant change in our practice, because we realized if we want changes to happen in classrooms, we should have teachers looking at their own practice, number one, and it has to happen often and many times.

DD leaders, such as the two above, reported that the contents and layout of the Self-coaching Guide was not the challenge and, in fact, reported that these aspect of the guide were quite strong; rather it was how best to leverage these strengths. DD leaders also discussed additional uses of the *Self-Coaching Guide* such as school leaders employing it as a non-evaluative assessment of DD practice and as a staff development tool.

Current Preoccupations: New Opportunities, Old Questions, and Competition

DD leaders described the current state of affairs of Origins and DD in terms of growth and success, on one hand, and new and ongoing challenges on the other. DD leaders described a number of recent and ongoing accomplishments that pointed to the growth and success of the DD approach. Among these accomplishments were: training a dozen Knowledge is Power Program (KIPP) principals; the development and launching of several pilot programs; launching the e-coaching model; publishing the *Self-Coaching Guide*; preparing new DD publications; working with University researchers (including this study and the study it draws from); and establishing long-standing partnerships with several model DD schools such as those mentioned previously. Furthermore, DD leaders expressed enthusiasm that several districts were interested in developing training and coaching models to “saturate” their entire districts with the DD approach.

In the midst of these accomplishments, DD leaders also described their current work as continuing to grapple with three ongoing challenges, as well as new market threat. Among these challenges were: increasing fidelity of DD implementation; customizing trainings and other supports to meet schools’ unique needs (and constraints); and maintaining partnerships with previously trained schools and districts. Saturating districts with the DD approach, in particular, raised questions of “how to help districts be their own managers of their own implementation” given the time it would take to bring an entire district to fidelity and the cost-prohibitiveness (due to amount of travel and lodging) of districts relying on DD expert coaches. DD is currently developing a model to train in-district workshop facilitators to address the aforementioned concerns. However, DD leaders expressed concerns of potentially compromising workshop fidelity and facilitator quality using this approach to district-level scale up.

One new challenge facing Origins and DD was the recent expiration of a ten-year non-compete clause with Responsive Classroom. Immediately following the recent expiration of the non-compete clause, Responsive Classroom had begun to develop products for and market to middle schools. One DD leader referred to Responsive Classroom as a “direct competitor” whose emergence presented a challenge not seen before:

We’ve been thinking a lot about Responsive Classroom. This summer they’re bringing their middle school work online. That’s a direct competitor with us. And a certain percentage of our work comes from elementary schools that have Responsive Classroom.

That's has us on our toes thinking about how we need to be different, how we need to deal with that. That's never been an issue for us before.

As mentioned in Chapter Four, Responsive Classroom formed the basis for the construction of the DD approach, complicating efforts to differentiate DD to and in middle schools.

Discussion

In essence, my description of DD's design for practice (Chapter Four) and DD's formal and social supports of practice (Chapter Five) represent ideals; that is, they do not contend with any aspect of implementation. While such a treatment was necessary to understand DD as designed and its array of supports, it also omits important information such as school context and real-world application. Chapter Five expanded these considerations by including some of the school- and teacher-level factors that influenced the teachers' understandings of the DD design and uses of DD's supports of practice at two DD-trained school sites. This chapter expands on these themes by describing the collective reflections of three long-serving DD leaders on their work in developing capabilities for DD practice in schools across the country.

DD leaders identified a number of challenges to developing capabilities for DD practice emanating both from within DD schools themselves as well as their broader schooling environments. These factors were described not only as negatively impacting DD implementation but also shaping Origins as an organization and DD leaders' work in and with schools (and teachers). DD leaders described several school-level and environmental factors that influenced implementation of their designs for practice and their ability to develop teachers' DD capabilities. They also reported the ways in which these challenges resulted in important organizational dilemmas and shifts.

One unanticipated finding was the way in which the shifts within schools/schooling environments (described above as well as others) shaped Origins as an organization. These organizational shifts were, at times, aligned to Origins' desire for economic survival and competitiveness, yet counterproductive with respect to developing capabilities for DD practice (and meeting DD leaders' stated goal of increasing fidelity of DD implementation).

Another unanticipated finding was the perception DD leaders had regarding the role that increased school-based internal coaching had in weakening Origins' partnerships with DD-trained schools and, by extension, weakening the development of DD capabilities and the level of implementation fidelity. These findings were warranted despite internal coaching being

reported by DD leaders as one of the most integral supports of practice necessary for the development of DD capabilities as well as long-term sustainability of the DD approach. While cost (e.g., travel and lodging of Origins' staff) was reported to be a primary factor in attenuating ongoing partnerships between Origins and DD schools (including the use of DD expert coaches), the development of internal school-based coaches, many of whom did not have expertise in DD, was reported as another critical factor.

In sum, although the focus of my analytic framework centers on the interdependent use of formal and social supports to build capabilities of practice, these findings point to broader factors that inhibit the effectiveness of such supports and the development of capabilities.

CHAPTER VIII

DISCUSSION

Introduction

My critical reading of the literature suggested that the success of school improvement and reform required an increased focus on developing teachers' capabilities for practice, defined as the requisite skills, tools and knowledge to perform in new ways. This analysis pointed to large-scale capabilities of practice as often emerging from ongoing partnerships between external providers (e.g., charter/educational management organizations, comprehensive school reform providers and for- non-profit entities) and schools. Most importantly, my analysis of the literature on creating large-scale instructional capabilities in schools supported that such capabilities result largely from the interdependent use of formal (embodiments of existing knowledge such as routines, structures and codified materials) and social (professional, collegial exchanges of expertise) supports of practice

I used this lens to explore one commercialized program's attempt to define and develop classroom management capabilities for Tier 1 PBIS among teachers in two comparable middle schools. My findings complicated the narrative described above. Below, I discuss the implications this study has for my initial framing of this issue, including the use of formal and social supports of practice, and the work of developing capabilities for practice, in general.

Formal and Social Supports

Teachers unanimously placed the highest value on two social supports: the DD1 workshop and on collaborative exchanges and problem-solving with peers. The DD1 workshop was held in such high regard due to its design that centered on providing teachers with an immersive, experiential learning experience. With respect to ongoing capability development, many teachers preferred to leverage the expertise of their trusted peers and colleagues and, in fact, preferred such supports to external guidance and support (e.g., external, expert coaching).

DD's approach to creating capabilities for practice heavily emphasized procedural guidance designed to assist teachers with in-classroom use/enactment (i.e. scripts, routines, teacher planning resources, specific strategizes/structures); however, this guidance was largely

underutilized, if not ignored. This study supports that while teachers can hold almost unanimous for some practice supports (i.e. first-principles underlying an approach and workshop/training), they can simultaneously remain more anemic to categories of support designed to more definitively shape their day-to-day practice.

Social Supports: Designs, Best Practices and Incidental Learning Networks

Below, I discuss the implications my findings have with respect to the use of social supports in developing capabilities for practice with respect to: (a) adult-centered, experiential learning modalities as key to the design of professional learning activities; (b) the sensitivity of coaching to the fidelity to high-leverage coaching practices (and expertise); and (c) the importance of organic, incidental and/or informal learning networks to the work of capability building.

Designs for professional learning. One thing that was unanimous among all teachers—regardless of subject matter, grade-level, years of experience or degree of use of DD practices—was the high regard for the DD1 week-long workshop. DD1 was the highest valued support of practice (formal or social) because of its very intentional design. This workshop design approached developing initial capabilities for DD practice through creating a learning environment centered on social-constructivism, community and experiential learning. Importantly, this workshop was designed to give teachers a highly immersive, authentic and participatory experience around the very philosophy and practices they would be expected to implement in their classrooms. Teachers’ high regard of this approach to teacher learning, coupled with the fact that such learning opportunities are outliers rather than norms, begs the question of how to diffuse this professional learning design into the day-to-day, month-to-month professional development work of schools and school districts.

Sensitivity of coaching effects to the use of coaching ‘best practices.’ Coaching has been identified as a critical support in the implementation sciences. Yet both external (expert DD coaching) and internal coaching (school-based, internal coaching) were not valued as key supports in developing capabilities for DD practice. While DD expert coaches clearly had a command of the DD approach, it was the coaching model (e.g., lack of frequency, focus and specificity of feedback) employed with teachers (in part) that lead to the perception that DD expert coaching was not a useful support in developing their classroom management capabilities. Conversely, although internal coaches utilized a very detailed and rich coaching model, their

lack of explicit focus on DD, and lack of expertise with specific DD practices, contributed to internal coaching also being perceived as lacking value with respect to developing DD capabilities.⁶³ Although the coaching literature and research is still emergent, this study points to coaching effectiveness being dependent on many of the knowledge, practices and modalities that are beginning to emerge as evidence-based coaching practices. These include: frequent coaching interactions, explicit goal(s), and expertise in both coaching itself as well as the targeted practice(s) of improvement.

One of the things that emerged in my analysis of the coaching models employed with teachers, DD leaders' perceptions of the affordances of the more directive approach used by external coaches compared to the more teacher-driven, reflective model typically employed by internal, school-based coaches. DD leaders believed that the tendency of internal coaches to focus on teacher reflection rather than providing explicit guidance was more the result of the limitations professional norms (i.e. collegiality, egalitarianism, union prohibitions regarding staff in the same bargaining unit evaluating the effectiveness of peers) than what was known to effectively change practice. Future research might investigate these different approaches to coaching (direct guidance vs. reflective practice), how they are perceived by teaching practitioners and the success or failure with which they result in changed teaching practice.

Incidental (or informal) professional networks. In an effort to capture unplanned, collegial exchanges of knowledge and problem-solving, my analytic framework dichotomized social supports of practice into designed (or planned) social supports and incidental (or informal, organic) social supports. This study points to organic learning networks as an important category of support. Importantly, these informal learning networks were dependent on existence of collegial norms and cohesion already embedded within some teacher groups (i.e. grade-level; subject area; proximity to each other's classrooms, etc.). That incidental, collegial exchanges of knowledge and problem-solving showed up as heavily as they did and were so highly regarded by teachers point the need to know more about what gives rise to the existence of such networks and what it means to encourage, leverage and give further life and legitimacy to this type of learning. It also points to the need to better understand how the existence of such networks contributes to teachers' practice capabilities.

⁶³ During the rare occasions DD was the focus of internal coaching at JGMS, and viewed as ineffective, there is also the possibility that DD, as a Tier 1 intervention, more intensive interventions were needed.

Formal Supports: Principles vs. Routines

Formal supports range in degree of prescriptiveness. On one end of the continuum are first-principles, a type of formal support involving the implicit/explicit transmission of the broad premises, postulates and goals that then help inform design. On the other end are scripts (rare) and routines, strategies and structures (common) that structure behavior and decision-making. Most teachers were highly committed to DD's first-principles (e.g., relationship-based and needs-based tenants of (mis) behavior and behavior management) but ignored or underutilized other, more prescriptive categories of formal supports.

This is important because, as stated previously, the affordances of formal supports for practice are contingent not only on their effective design but on their actual use. This study's findings are aligned with research pointing to teachers (and schools) as fairly resistant to external guidance concerning what to do and how to do it. Additionally, this study shows that schools and teachers can actively support the program adoption, belong to a school considered by program providers to be highly committed to implementation, be philosophically aligned to a program/approach's underling principles and, yet, still remain relatively anemic to the specific, detailed guidance intended to shape their day-to-day practice (e.g., scripts, routines, specific strategies/structures).

Interdependence Among Formal and Social Supports: Limitations and Considerations

This study points to the idea that certain capabilities are more easily developed by the complimentary use of formal and social supports (i.e. knowledge and skills) than other less tangible, more abstract capabilities for practice (e.g., disposition/mindset). Neither formal nor social supports of practice explicitly focused on the development of teacher mindset despite it being an explicit and critical capability of practice.

This leads questioning whether or not program providers and support designers know how to do this type of work. Were DD leaders limited by the current provision of social and formal supports they had at their disposal? Time to work with teachers? Both?

More to the point, how, exactly, do we define and develop teacher mindset capabilities? The paucity of explicit focus contained within both types of supports raises the question of what types (or configurations) of formal and social supports of practice might best develop teacher beliefs and attitudes in support of specific interventions? One area that research might address is the ways in which program providers (and school leaders) specifically can actively develop in-

service teachers' beliefs, attitudes and dispositions to fit the demands of adopted interventions and goals.

Relatedly, the relative weakness of DD supports in developing certain capabilities for practice—such as reactive/corrective discipline and teacher mindset(s)—also point to the need to treat specific capabilities of practice as the point of departure when designing formal and social supports of practice. Neither reactive/corrective discipline nor teacher mindset(s), for instance, fit as well into the current array of DD supports as developing teachers' knowledge and skill capabilities did. With respect to developing capabilities for correcting misbehavior, the *Real Time Teacher Coaching Model* accompanying the *No Nonsense Nurturer* classroom management and instructional program is a good example of more properly coordinated formal and social supports. In this intervention and coaching model, teachers work with trained coaches who use “bug in the ear” technology to provide immediate feedback and guidance thereby allowing teachers to take immediate correction in support of specific classroom management strategies.

A More Comprehensive View on The Work of Capability Building

The motivation for this study was to better understand how to develop teachers' capabilities for practice. The ways in which teachers reported DD shaped their practice varied widely. Although variation in levels of implementation is unsurprising, the broad causes of this variation pointed to both a more elaborated conceptualization of practice capabilities and a framework for thinking about the enablers and constraints of doing this kind of work.

Capabilities for Practice: Expanded Conceptualizations

Technical problem and/or adaptive challenge? My initial definition of capabilities of practice included knowledge, skills and tools. What this definition assumes is that the problems of practice facing teachers, schools and leaders are entirely *technical* in nature and, therefore, remedied through technical solutions. However, this study supports that challenges facing school practitioners are also *adaptive* in nature. Whereas technical problems are easy to identify, can be solved by readily available solutions, experts or edicts and incite little or no resistance, adaptive challenges require changes in values, beliefs, roles, relationships, loyalties and, as a result, often invite resistance (Heifetz et al., 2009). Furthermore, whereas a solutions-oriented approach is appropriate for addressing technical problems, adaptive challenges require a more experimental approach to problem-solving (Heifetz et al., 2009). Viewing classroom management as a

technical problem rather than an adaptive challenge (or both), may explain some of the variation in how DD shaped teachers' practice.

Definition of capabilities for practice. An important wrinkle in my initial framing of capability building was that teacher disposition or mindset—dispositions, beliefs, and/or attitudes—did not feature heavily in my critical analysis of the literature nor, as a result, my definition of capabilities for practice. Yet both DD leaders and the teachers most committed to the DD approach agreed that a teacher's mindset(s)—regarding the purpose(s) of reactive discipline and the balance of teacher-student power, specifically—was key to buy-in (or resistance to the approach) and program fidelity. This study supports that teacher mindset (dispositions, beliefs and attitudes) and its intentional development are key to both capability building and implementation fidelity.

Distributed Cognition: The Influence of School, Teacher, and Leader-Level Factors

The variation in the ways in which capabilities for practice were developed—vis-à-vis both the reported changes in teachers' practice and the factors that enabled and constrained the development of capabilities—were attributed to both individual characteristics (e.g., a particular teacher's mindset regarding discipline) as well as external factors (i.e. school contextual factors and leadership practice). These findings are supportive of James Spillane and his colleagues' work positing that implementation in schools should be viewed through the lens of distributed cognition rather than as an individual, teacher-level response to innovation. As stated by Spillane et al. (2006), distributed cognition “is an essential lens for understanding education policy implementation, especially the implementation of policies that demand significant shifts in teachers' practice (p. 46).”

School-level leaders and leadership practice. This study points to school leaders and their leadership practice as indirect yet critical mediators of the development of practice capabilities and program implementation. With respect to the uptake of external designs, leaders indirectly influence teachers' practice in three ways: integrating an approach into the school organization (e.g., staff meeting time, informal assessments of classroom instruction, professional development), sense-giving (or ongoing signaling regarding expectations for implementation (and its importance), and through monitoring and accountability.

This study points to the idea that to the extent that school leaders either delegate oversight of capability building to either external providers or school staff (i.e. internal coaches,

individual teachers), the likelihood that these capabilities will be diffused is much less likely. Instead, school leaders must actively communicate to teachers and internal coaches what aspects of the program, approach or intervention are critically important and combine such sense-giving measures with integrative school-level supports and active monitoring of implementation. Or, as described by one school-leader who attributed variable implementation to her lack of oversight, “inspect what you expect.”

Furthermore, one of the questions which this study gives rise to is that, what does it mean to be an adaptive school leader in an educational environment which privileges technical solutions? Given the importance of school leaders to capability building (even around externally supported designs) and that much of this work be adaptive in nature and involve changing teachers mindsets, there is a need to better understand the implications this has for broader conceptualizations of and repertoires for school leadership.

School context. This study reminds researchers and practitioners that policies, programs, interventions and initiatives do not enter the proverbial schooling vacuum. To the contrary, the interpretation, implementation and outcomes of all of the above are highly sensitive to the peculiar schooling contexts (and environments) they enter. Although the two schools included in this study were comparable in several key ways (e.g., years of program implementation, stability of school leaders and staff, proportion of students historically considered at-risk, high commitment to the approach), much of the variation that was described herein is attributed to their *differences* (rather programmatic factors). School leadership practice and the presence (or lack thereof) of competing school initiatives are characteristics worthy of further consideration on behalf of researchers and practitioners.

Teacher mindset. Similar to expanding the definition and conceptualization of capabilities for practice to include teacher mindset, this study points to the need to understand more about how teacher beliefs, attitudes and dispositions enable and constrain teachers’ perceptions, understanding, and use of specific practices, interventions and innovations. Importantly, it also points to the need to understand more about how to strategically shape teacher mindset commensurate with the underlying principles and shifts in practice required by specific change initiatives.

The Shared Enterprise of Developing Capabilities for External Designs

Another important finding that my critical analysis and analytic framework did not anticipate was the critical role of locally created, school-based supports in supporting implementation of external designs. Neither did my critical analysis nor analytic framework include the role that school-level leaders and leadership might play in the implementation of external designs. Yet both locally created supports and leadership practice were critical influences on teachers' understanding and implementation of the approach. Teachers' valuing of locally created supports of practice (e.g., informal teacher networks)—and the influence of school-level leadership—point to the need to investigate the ways in which capability building in support of external designs should be a shared enterprise among external experts, school leaders and teachers.

CHAPTER IX

CONCLUSION

The best analogy representing the unfolding of this study is this: seeing a protruding thread in a sweater, pulling it (in order to remove it), and having it continuously and, somewhat unexpectedly, unravel. That is, what began as a study concerned with learning more about how to create large-scale capabilities (in this case for classroom management) through the use of formal and social supports of practice, largely became a story of the various environmental, school, leader and teacher-level factors that enable and, more often, constrain this work.

The motivation for this study was to learn more about what it meant to change relatively stable, and often, ineffectual teaching practice, particularly among teachers working in especially difficult school settings. The experiences that lead to this focus involved working in a school that was always in one cycle or another of school improvement, school turnaround, program adoption and evaluation yet with the result of classroom practice, much like everything else, remaining largely unchanged.

Ultimately, this study's findings echo what is largely known: schools as a whole are not yet knowledgeable enough, nor designed with the intent, to facilitate, support, drive and sustain more than minor and often, short-term, shifts in practice.

This study also points to the importance of teacher mindset (e.g., attitudes and beliefs) and school leadership (i.e. leader sense-giving, integrative supports, accountability/monitoring) as powerful mediators of program fidelity, teacher change and the general success and failure of school initiatives.

Lastly, it raises important questions about the nature of the changes in schooling practices we seek—technical and/or adaptive—and what this means for differences in the types of interventions, supports of practice and leadership practice each requires.

Importantly, a simple way to view this study's findings is through the lens of a lack of fidelity to a support intervention (and the breakdown of that very support intervention over time). As (Poduska and Kurki, 2014), remind us, “moving programs into practice requires an understanding that the *programmatic intervention*...and the *support intervention*... are

independent, though interrelated components of a whole” (original emphasis, p. 83). In other words, transforming practice requires not only effective designs but also effective support structures necessary to breathe life into these designs. DD leaders described a rich support structure including: two to three weeks of expert coaching, the development of a core team (of high implementing teachers), peer coaches and modal classrooms, the employment of implementation frameworks and checklists, and school leaders who had the requisite knowledge and skill necessary to support the approach as a result of participating in DD’s Principals’ Institute. Yet most aspects of this support structure had slowly drifted into extinction by way of a schooling environment financially strapped that could no longer afford it on one hand, and, on the other hand, schools (and school leaders) that had too many competing initiatives to commit to the demands such a support structure required. While the programmatic intervention remained largely unchanged, its support structure devolved over time as the external provider attempted to act on (and be acted upon) the larger school environment.

In sum, what this study confirms is that school and teacher change is extraordinarily difficult work. It requires comprehensive, integrated and systemic approaches, long-term commitment and capable, active leadership. That both schools in this study had stable (and mostly well-regarded) leadership, stable teaching staffs and indicators of relatively healthy school cultures and achieved such variable results, only reinforces the exacting demands that a more invasive, drastic school and teacher change initiative would likely require.

Although this seems sobering it is much less so when one considers that many teachers did, in fact, benefit from the approach under study. While a few teachers said that it transformed their practice, many more teachers reported that it helped them in less transformative, but nonetheless important, ways.

Perhaps this is enough. If not, what this study points to is the need to make the commitments necessary to drive focused, deep, sustainable, transformative change in schools over time. It also points to the need to learn more about approaching school improvement, teacher change and leadership from an adaptive, rather than solely technical, perspective.

APPENDIX A: Comparison of Scaled Variables for Teacher Survey

TABLE A: DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS—SCALED VARIABLES (N=54)

Descriptive Statistics – Scaled Variables (N = 54)								
Scale	N	M	SD	Range		DF	t-Value	Sig
				Minimum	Maximum			
Teaching adolescents								
James Garfield	30	3.91	.48	2.00	4.50	52	-0.94	.351
Sibley	24	4.02	.32	3.50	4.75			
Teaching beliefs								
James Garfield	30	4.10	.31	3.42	4.83	52	0.06	.952
Sibley	24	4.09	.45	3.33	5.00			
Cultural responsive teaching								
James Garfield	30	3.90	.45	2.75	4.88	51	-2.53	.014
Sibley	23	4.22	.48	3.56	5.00			
Authoritative teaching								
James Garfield	30	4.45	.36	3.63	5.00	50	-1.38	.174
Sibley	22	4.59	.41	4.00	5.00			
Teaching practices								
James Garfield	30	3.93	.39	3.24	4.44	50	-1.78	.081
Sibley	22	4.13	.41	3.00	4.84			
Teacher collaboration								
James Garfield	30	3.42	.52	2.43	4.14	50	-0.20	.842
Sibley	22	3.47	1.09	1.43	4.71			
Collective efficacy beliefs								
James Garfield	30	4.09	.47	3.25	5.00	50	0.61	.951
Sibley	22	4.08	.63	2.50	5.00			
Impact of teaching efforts								
James Garfield	29	3.78	.47	2.75	4.75	49	0.18	.862
Sibley	22	3.75	.63	1.00	5.00			
Level of satisfaction with teaching								
James Garfield	29	3.70	.47	2.80	5.00	49	-1.06	.296
Sibley	22	3.84	.45	3.00	4.75			
Stress Factors								
James Garfield	30	3.25	.52					
Sibley*								
Impact of Teaching Efforts								
James Garfield	29	3.74	.40					
Sibley*								

Notes. All numeric items were coded using Likert scale (1-5). Analyses were performed separately for each school to accommodate for differences in school surveys. Numeric responses were summed and mean scores were obtained for each subscale. Subscale files for both schools were then merged for analysis. The mean scores were used in analyzing survey data.

APPENDIX B

Teacher Survey

Participant ID

Developmental Designs Teacher Survey Spring 2015

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this survey. Your responses will help us understand the experiences of teachers at your school this academic year. Please complete each item honestly. Your individual answers will not be shared with anyone at your school. Please fill the bubbles completely in.

BACKGROUND	
<p>1. What grades are you teaching this year?</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 6th grade</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 7th grade</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 8th grade</p> <p>2. What subjects are you teaching this year?</p> <p><input type="radio"/> English/ELA</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Social Studies/History</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Science</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Math</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Foreign Language</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Elective (band/choir/gym/art)</p> <p>3. Did you participate in any of the following professional development activities during the past six months (check all that apply)?</p> <p>a) University course(s) related to teaching</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="radio"/> No</p> <p>b) Workshops, conferences or training sessions in which you were a presenter</p>	<p>c) Other workshops, conferences or training sessions in which you were NOT a presenter</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="radio"/> No</p> <p>d) Observational visits to other schools</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="radio"/> No</p> <p>e) Observational visits in your school</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="radio"/> No</p> <p>f) Coaching support (external, not from within the school)</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="radio"/> No</p> <p>g) Coaching support (school staff/colleague, from within the school)</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="radio"/> No</p> <p>4. What type of teacher are you?</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Regular/General</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Special Education</p>

<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	
---	--

TEACHING ADOLESCENTS

<i>Read each of the following statements. Then decide the extent to which you agree or disagree.</i>	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree or agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. There are lots of things a teacher can do to have good relationships with their adolescent students.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Teachers can have a powerful influence on young adolescents.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Schools can be successful with young adolescents only if they make a special effort to meet the changing needs of this age group.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Young adolescents are so influenced by their friends that what adults say or do matters very little to them.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

TEACHING BELIEFS

<i>Indicate your opinion about each of the statements below.</i>	Not at All	Very Little	Some	Quite a Bit	A Great Deal
1. How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in schoolwork?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well on their schoolwork?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. How much can you do to help your students value learning?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. To what extent can you craft good questions for your students?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. How much can you do to get children to follow classroom rules?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. How much can you do to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. How well can you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

9. How much can you use a variety of assessment strategies?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10. To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation or example when students are confused?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
11. How much can you assist families in helping their children do well in school?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
12. How well can you implement alternative strategies in your classroom?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

CULTURALLY RESPONSIVE TEACHING

<i>Read each of the following statements. Then decide the extent to which you agree or disagree.</i>	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree or agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. I am able to gain information about my students' cultural backgrounds.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. I teach students about their cultures' contributions in the content areas.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. I am able to identify ways that the school culture (e.g. values, norms, and practices) is different from my students' home culture.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. I design instruction that matches my students' developmental needs.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. I use my knowledge of students' cultural background to help make learning meaningful.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. I am able to identify the ways students communicate at home and know they may differ from the school norms.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree or agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
7. I explain new concepts using examples that are taken from my students' everyday lives.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. I revise instructional material to include a better representation of cultural groups	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

AUTHORITATIVE TEACHING

<i>Read each of the following statements. Then decide the extent to which you agree or disagree.</i>	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree or agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. I work actively to create good relationships with my students.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. I show interest in each student.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. I often praise my students.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. I show the students that I care about them (not only when it comes to academic work).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. I have established routines/rules for how the students are supposed to act when they change activity/workplace etc.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. I have established routines/rules for how the students are supposed to act in whole group teaching sessions.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. I have established routines/rules for individual work.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. I closely monitor the students' behavior in class.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

TEACHING PRACTICES

<i>How characteristic is each of the following practices for you and your classroom?</i>	Not at all	A little	Somewhat	Very	Extremely characteristic
1. I model for students how to do classroom procedures (e.g., ways to turn in papers) and new learning activities.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. I give explicit instructions about what students are supposed to do.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. We use time-out or take a break as a way to help students regain self-control.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. I collaborate with students to create classroom rules and expectations.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. I give students opportunities to practice expected behaviors.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

<i>How characteristic is each of the following practices for you and your classroom?</i>	Not at all	A little	Somewhat	Very	Extremely characteristic
6. We hold class meetings so that we can discuss and solve class problems.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. I encourage students when they are doing something well.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Students are given problems that have many ways to come up with an answer.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. I encourage students to discuss their work with classmates.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10. I provide clear learning targets and specific supports to guide all students toward achieving the target.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
11. I ask students to explain how they got their answers.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
12. Students get to help plan what and how they are going to learn.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
13. I consider my students abilities and challenges when choosing lessons and materials.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
14. Students and I monitor progress on their individual academic and social goals.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
15. We talk about how things we are learning relate to other school and community issues.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
16. I use signals to gain the attention of my class (raised hand, clapping pattern).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
17. I have an advisory or class meeting period in the morning.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
18. There is a specific time set aside in advisory for student sharing.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
19. I use an activity in the advisory/class meeting to build community in the classroom.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
20. I re-teach rules and expectations when students show difficulty behaving appropriately.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

21. I provide students with opportunities for whole group, small group and individual work activities.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
22. Students are invited to think about how they did on activities and assignments.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
23. I use questions and statements to help students remember expected behaviors.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
24. When misbehaviors occur, I develop a clear plan with students to avoid problems in the future.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
25. I use fun, hands-on activities to help engage students in classroom activities.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

TEACHER COLLABORATION

<i>How often have you taken part in the following this academic year?</i>	Never	Once a year	A few times a year	Once or twice a month	Once a week or more often
1. Discussing books or articles on teaching and/or education with another teacher	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Co-planning with another teacher	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Discussing teaching problems or practices with another teacher	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Having your teaching observed by another teacher (not for evaluation)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Working on plans for school policies or activities with other teachers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Co-teaching	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Observing another teacher in their classroom	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

COLLECTIVE EFFICACY BELIEFS

<i>Indicate your opinion about each of the statements below.</i>	Not at All	Very Little	Some	Quite a Bit	A Great Deal
1. How much can teachers in your school do to produce meaningful student learning?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

2. How much can your school do to get students to believe they can do well on their schoolwork?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. To what extent can teachers in your school make expectations clear about appropriate student behavior?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. To what extent can school personnel in your school establish rules and procedures that facilitate learning?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. How much can teachers in your school do to help students master complex content?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. How much can teachers in your school do to promote deep understanding of academic concepts?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. How well can teachers in your school respond to defiant students?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. How much can school personnel in your school do to control disruptive behavior?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. How much can teachers in your school do to help students think critically?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10. How well can adults in your school get students to follow school rules?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
11. How much can your school do to foster student creativity?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
12. How much can your school do to help students feel safe while they are at school?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

SOURCES OF STRESS

<i>As a teacher, how great a source of stress were these factors for you...?</i>	Not at All	Very Little	Some	Quite a Bit	A Great Deal
1. Student disrespectful/impolite behavior	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Too much classroom work to do (e.g., paperwork, class preparation)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Under-prepared/low-achieving students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Too many extra duties/responsibilities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Unmotivated students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Responsibility for student achievement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Too many new or competing school initiatives	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

8. Limited administrative support	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
-----------------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

9. Large class sizes	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

IMPACT OF TEACHING EFFORTS

Please compare your classroom now with your classroom last year. <i>Overall, how much do you think your teaching:</i>	Not at all	Just a little	Some	Quite a bit	A lot
1. Improves the behavior of your students?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Improves the climate of your classroom?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Reduces your need to make referrals to the office for discipline problems?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Improves academic engagement of your students?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Overall:

1. How pleased are you with your current teaching practices?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. How motivated are you to improve your teaching practices?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. How easy is it for you to improve your teaching practices, given the demands on your time?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. How well do your current practices match with your ideal teaching style?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. To what degree did your school achieve its expressed school improvement goals?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Thank you for completing our survey! ☺

REFERENCES

- Adler, P. S., & Borys, B. (1996). Two types of bureaucracy: Enabling and coercive. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 61-89.
- Artman-Meeker, K., Hemmeter, M. L., & Snyder, P. (2014). Effects of distance coaching on teachers' use of pyramid model practices: A pilot study. *Infants & Young Children*, 27(4), 325-344.
- Atkinson, P., & Coffey, A. (2003). Revisiting the relationship between participant observation and interviewing. *Inside Interviewing: New lenses, New Concerns*, 415-428.
- Baden-Fuller, C., & Winter, S. G. (2005). Replicating organizational knowledge: principles or templates? *Papers on Economics and Evolution*, No. 0515.
- Barrett, S.B., Bradshaw, C. P., & Lewis-Palmer, T. (2008). Maryland statewide PBIS initiative systems, evaluation, and next steps. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 10(2), 105-114.
- Becker, H., & Geer, B. (1957). Participant observation and interviewing: A comparison. *Human Organization*, 16(3), 28-32.
- Benedict, E. A., Horner, R. H., & Squires, J. K. (2007). Assessment and implementation of positive behavior support in preschools. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education*, 27(3), 174-192.
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27-40.
- Brackett, M. A., Reyes, M. R., Rivers, S. E., Elbertson, N. A., & Salovey, P. (2012). Assessing teachers' beliefs about social and emotional learning. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, 30(3), 219-236.
- Bradshaw, C. P., Bottiani, J. H., Osher, D., & Sugai, G. (2014). The integration of positive behavioral interventions and supports and social and emotional learning. In *Handbook of School Mental Health* (pp. 101-118). New York: Springer US.
- Bradshaw, C.P., Pas, E. T., Bloom, J., Barrett, S., Hershfeldt, P., Alexander, A., & Leaf, P. J. (2012). A state-wide partnership to promote safe and supportive schools: the PBIS Maryland initiative. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, 39(4), 225-237.

- Bradshaw, C., Reinke, W., Brown, L., Bevans, K., & Leaf, P. (2008). Implementation of schoolwide positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS) in elementary schools: Observations from a randomized trial. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 31(1), 1-26.
- Bradshaw, C., & Pas, E. T. (2011). A statewide scale up of positive behavioral interventions and supports: A description of the development of systems of support and analysis of adoption and implementation. *School Psychology Review*, 40(4), 530-548.
- Brown, J. S., & Duguid, P. (1991). Organizational learning and communities-of-practice: Toward a unified view of working, learning, and innovation. *Organization Science*, 2(1), 40-57.
- Bryk, A. S., Camburn, E., & Louis, K. S. (1999). Professional community in Chicago elementary schools: Facilitating factors and organizational consequences. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 35(5), 751-781.
- Bryk, A. S. (2010). Organizing schools for improvement. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 91(7), 23-30.
- Bryk, A. S. (2009). Support a science of performance improvement. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 90(8), 597-600.
- Bryk, A. S., Sebring, P. B., Allensworth, E., Luppescu, S., and Easton, J. Q. (2010). Organizing schools for improvement: Lessons from Chicago. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bulkley, K. E., & Hicks, J. (2005). Managing community: Professional community in charter schools operated by educational management organizations. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 41(2), 306-348.
- Carr, E. C., & Worth, A. (2001). The use of the telephone interview for research. *Nursing Times Research*, 6(1), 511-524.
- Carter, D., & Norman, R. (2010). Class-wide positive behavior support in preschool: Improving teacher implementation through consultation. *Early Childhood Educational Journal*, 38(4), 279-288.
- Chitiyo, M., & Wheeler, J. (2009). Challenges faced by school teachers in implementing positive behavior support in their school systems. *Remedial and Special Education*, 30(1), 58-63.
- Cohen, D. K. (2011). *Teaching and its predicaments*. Harvard University Press.
- Cohen, D. K., Raudenbush, S. W., & Ball, D. L. (2003). Resources, instruction, and research. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 25(2), 119-142.
- Cohen, D. K., Peurach, D. J., Glazer, J. L., Gates, K. E., & Goldin, S. (2013). *Improvement by design: The promise of better schools*. University of Chicago Press.

- Cornett, J., & Knight, J. (2009). Research on coaching. *Coaching: Approaches and Perspectives*, 192-216.
- Crawford, L. (2008). *The advisory book: Building a community of learners grades 5-9*. Minneapolis: Origins.
- Crawford, L., & Hagedorn, C. (2009). *The advisory book study guide*. Minneapolis: Origins.
- Desimone, L. M., & LeFloch, K. C. (2004). Are we asking the right questions? Using cognitive interviews to improve surveys in education research. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 26(1), 1-22.
- Developmental Designs 1 resource book*. (2012). Minneapolis: Origins.
- Developmental Designs 2 resource book*. (2012). Minneapolis: Origins.
- Developmental Designs sampler resource book*. (2011). Minneapolis: Origins.
- Developmental Designs responding to rule breaking resource book*. (2014). Minneapolis: Origins.
- Domitrovich, C., Dusenbury, L., & Weissberg, R. (2015a). Effective social and emotional learning programs: Middle and high school edition. 2015 CASEL Guide.
- Domitrovich, C. E., Pas, E. T., Bradshaw, C. P., Becker, K. D., Keperling, J. P., Embry, D. D., & Jalongo, N. (2015b). Individual and school organizational factors that influence implementation of the PAX good behavior game intervention. *Prevention Science*, 1-11.
- Durlak, J. A., Weissberg, R. P., Dymnicki, A. B., Taylor, R. D., & Schellinger, K. B. (2011). The impact of enhancing students' social and emotional learning: A meta-analysis of school-based universal interventions. *Child Development*, 82(1), 405-432.
- Elias, M. J., & Schwab, Y. (2006). From compliance to responsibility: Social and emotional learning and classroom management. *Handbook of Classroom Management: Research, Practice, and Contemporary Issues*, 309-341.
- Fallon, L. M., McCarthy, S. R., & Sanetti, L. M. H. (2014). Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (SWPBS) in the classroom: Assessing perceived challenges to consistent implementation in Connecticut schools. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 37(1), 1-24.
- Feldman, Martha S. (2000). Organizational routines as a source of continuous change. *Organization Science*, 11(6), 611.
- Feldman, Martha S., & Pentland, Brian T. (2003). Reconceptualizing organizational routines as a source of flexibility and change. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 48(1), 94-118.

- Feuerborn, L. L., & Tyre, A. D. (2012). Establishing positive discipline policies in an urban elementary school. *Contemporary School Psychology*, 16, 47-58.
- Fixsen, Dean L., Karen A. Blase, Sandra F. Naoom, and Frances Wallace. Core implementation components. *Research on Social Work Practice* 19, no. 5 (2009): 531-540.
- Fletcher, S., & Mullen, C. A. (Eds.). (2012). *Sage Handbook of Mentoring and Coaching in Education*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Franzen, K., & Kamps, D. (2008). The utilization and effects of positive behavior support strategies on an urban school playground. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 10(3), 150-161.
- Gioia, D. A., & Chittipeddi, K. (1991). Sensemaking and sensegiving in strategic change initiation. *Strategic management journal*, 12(6), 433-448.
- Glazer, J. L., & Peurach, D. P. (2015). Occupational control in education: The logic and leverage of epistemic communities. *Harvard Educational Review*, 85(2), 172-202.
- Han, S. S., & Weiss, B. (2005). Sustainability of teacher implementation of school-based mental health programs. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 33(6), 665-679.
- Halverson, R. (2003). Systems of practice: How leaders use artifacts to create professional community in schools. *Education Policy Analysis*. Archives, 11. Retrieved May 10, 2005, from <http://epaa.asa.edu/epaa/v11n37/>
- Hartsell, K., & Hayes, S. (2012, August). Spotlight on MiBLSi. *Spotlight Briefs*. Regional Resource Center Program.
- Heifetz, R. A., Grashow, A., & Linsky, M. (2009). *The practice of adaptive leadership: Tools and tactics for changing your organization and the world*. Harvard Business Press.
- Hiebert, J., Gallimore, R., & Stigler, J. W. (2002). A knowledge base for the teaching profession: What would it look like and how can we get one? *Educational Researcher*, 31(5), 3-15.
- Horner, R. H., Sugai, G., & Anderson, C. M. (2010). Examining the evidence base for schoolwide positive behavior support. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, 42(8), 1-14.
- Horsch, P., Chen, J. Q., & Wagner, S. L. (2002). The responsive classroom approach a caring, respectful school environment as a context for development. *Education and Urban Society*, 34(3), 365-383.
- Jones, S. M., Bailey, R., & Jacob, R. (2014). Social-emotional learning is essential to classroom management. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 96(2), 19-24.

- Kretlow, A., & Bartholomew, C. (2010). Using coaching to improve the fidelity of evidence-based practices: A review of studies. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 33(4), 279-299.
- Lampert, M. (2012). Improving teaching and teachers: A “generative dance”? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 63(5), 361-367.
- Lampert, M. (2010). Learning teaching in, from, and for practice: What do we mean? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(1-2), 21-34.
- Lampert, M., Boerst, T. A., & Graziani, F. (2011). Organizational resources in the service of schoolwide ambitious teaching practice. *Teachers College Record*, 113(7), 1361-1400.
- Levitt, B., & March, J. G. (1988). Organizational learning. *Annual review of sociology*, 14(1), 319-338.
- Little, J. (1990). The persistence of privacy: Autonomy and initiative in teachers' professional relations. *The Teachers College Record*, 91(4), 509-536.
- Lohrmann, S., Martin, S. D., & Patil, S. (2012). External and internal coaches' perspectives about overcoming barriers to universal interventions. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 15(1), 26-38.
- Lohrmann, S., Forman, S., Martin, S., & Palmieri, M. (2008). Understanding school personnel's resistance to adopting schoolwide positive behavior support at a universal level of intervention. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 10(4), 256-269.
- Lortie, D. C., & Clement, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study* (pp. 1-54). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Luiselli, J. K., Putnam, R. F., Handler, M. W., & Feinberg, A. B. (2005). Whole school positive behaviour support: effects on student discipline problems and academic performance. *Educational Psychology*, 25(2-3), 183-198.
- Lynass, L., Tsai, S. F., Richman, T. D., & Cheney, D. (2012). Social expectations and behavioral indicators in schoolwide positive behavior supports: A national study of behavior matrices. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 14(3), 153-161.
- Jagers, R., (2013). *Proposal for Sibley study*. (Unpublished study proposal). University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Jagers, R., & Kwame-Ross, T. (2013). *AEC revised study*. (Unpublished study proposal). University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

- Kincaid, D., Childs, K., Blase, K. A., & Wallace, F. (2007). Identifying barriers and facilitators in implementing schoolwide positive behavior support. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 9(3), 174-184.
- Kretlow, A., & Bartholomew, C. (2010). Using coaching to improve the fidelity of evidence-based practices: A review of studies. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 33(4), 279-299.
- Marchant, M., Christensen, L., Womack, S., Conley, L., & Fisher, A. (2010). Strengthening positive school discipline practices through professional development. *Education Research & Perspectives*, 37(2).
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2010). *Designing qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mathews, S., McIntosh, K., Frank, J. L., & May, S. L. (2013). Critical features predicting sustained implementation of school-wide positive behavioral interventions and supports. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 16(3), 168-178.
- McIntosh, K., Filter, K. J., Bennett, J. L., Ryan, C., & Sugai, G. (2010). Principles of sustainable prevention: Designing scale-up of school-wide positive behavior support to promote durable systems. *Psychology in the Schools*, 47(1), 5-21.
- Mendez, L. R., & Knopf, H. M. (2003). Who gets suspended from school and why: A demographic analysis of schools and disciplinary infractions in a large school district. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 26(1), 30-51.
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation: Revised and expanded from qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Miller, R. J., & Rowan, B. (2007). Organizational strategies for promoting instructional change: Implementation dynamics in schools working with comprehensive school reform providers. *American Educational Research Journal*, 44(2), 252.
- Müller, E. (2007). Statewide behavior initiatives. Project Forum. National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE).
- Michigan Department of Education. Multi-tiered systems of support (MTSS). Retrieved from http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,4615,7-140-28753_65803-322534--,00.html
- Motoca, L. M., Farmer, T. W., Hamm, J. V., Byun, S. Y., Lee, D. L., Brooks, D. S., ... & Moohr, M. M. (2014). Directed consultation, the SEALS model, and teachers' classroom management. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, 22(2), 119-129.
- Muscott, H. S., Mann, E. L., & LeBrun, M. R. (2008). Positive behavioral interventions and

- supports in New Hampshire: Effects of large-scale implementation of schoolwide positive behavior support on student discipline and academic achievement. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 10(3), 190-205.
- Myers, D., Simonsen, B., & Sugai, G. (2011). Increasing teachers' use of praise with a response-to-intervention approach. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 34(1), 35-59.
- Nelson, R. R., & Sidney, G. (2005). Winter (1982). An evolutionary theory of economic change. *Cambridge: Belknap*.
- Nese, R., Horner, R., Dickey, C., Stiller, B., & Tomlanovich, A. (2014). Decreasing bullying behaviors in middle school: Expect respect. *School Psychology Quarterly*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/spq0000070>.
- Newton, J. S., Horner, R. H., Algozzine, B., Todd, A. W., & Algozzine, K. (2012a). A randomized wait-list controlled analysis of the implementation integrity of team-initiated problem solving processes. *Journal of school psychology*, 50(4), 421-441.
- Newton, J. S., Horner, R. H., Todd, A. W., Algozzine, R. F., & Algozzine, K. M. (2012b). A pilot study of a problem-solving model for team decision making. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 35(1), 25-49.
- Nolan, J. D., Houlihan, D., Wanzek, M., & Jenson, W. R. (2014). The good behavior game: A classroom-behavior intervention effective across cultures. *School Psychology International*, 35(2), 191-205.
- Novick, G. (2008). Is there a bias against telephone interviews in qualitative research? *Research in Nursing & Health*, 31, 391-398.
- Osher, D., Bear, G. G., Sprague, J. R., & Doyle, W. (2010). How can we improve school discipline? *Educational Researcher*, 39(1), 48-58.
- Oxford Dictionaries Online (2017). Retrieved from <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com>.
- Pas, E. T., & Bradshaw, C. P. (2012). Examining the association between implementation and outcomes. *The Journal of Behavioral Health Services & Research*, 39(4), 417-433.
- Payne, C. M. (2008). *So much reform, so little change: The persistence of failure in urban schools*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Peurach, D.J. & Glazer, J.L. (2012). Reconsidering replication: New perspectives on large-scale school improvement. *Journal of Educational Change*, 13 (2), 155-190.
- Peurach, D. J., Glazer, J. L., & Lenhoff, S. W. (2014). The developmental evaluation of school improvement networks. *Educational Policy*. 30(4), 616-648.

- Peurach, D. J., Glazer, J. L., & Lenhoff, S. W. (2012). Make or buy? That's really not the question. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 93(7), 51-55.
- Peurach, D. (2011). *Seeing complexity in public education: Problems, possibilities, and Success for All*. Oxford University Press.
- Poduska, J. M., & Kurki, A. (2014). Guided by theory, informed by practice: Training and support for the good behavior game, a classroom-based behavior management strategy. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, 22(2), 83-94.
- Reinke, W. M., Stormont, M., Herman, K. C., Wang, Z., Newcomer, L., & King, K. (2014). Use of coaching and behavior support planning for students with disruptive behavior within a universal classroom management program. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, 22(2), 74-82.
- Reinke, W., Herman, K., & Stormont, M. (2013). Classroom-level positive behavior supports in schools implementing SW-PBIS: Identifying areas for enhancement. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 15(1), 39-50.
- Reinke, W. M., Herman, K. C., Stormont, M., Newcomer, L., & David, K. (2013). Illustrating the multiple facets and levels of fidelity of implementation to a teacher classroom management intervention. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, 40(6), 494-506.
- Reinke, W. M., Stormont, M., Webster-Stratton, C., Newcomer, L. L., & Herman, K. C. (2012). The incredible years teacher classroom management program: Using coaching to support generalization to real-world classroom settings. *Psychology in the Schools*, 49(5), 416-428.
- Resnick, L. B. (2010). Nested learning systems for the thinking curriculum. *Educational Researcher*, 39(3), 183-197.
- Rimm-Kaufman, S. E., & Sawyer, B. E. (2004). Primary-grade teachers' self-efficacy beliefs, attitudes toward teaching, and discipline and teaching practice priorities in relation to the "responsive classroom" approach. *The Elementary School Journal*, 104(4), 321-341.
- Rowan, B., & Miller, R. J. (2007). Organizational strategies for promoting instructional change: Implementation dynamics in schools working with comprehensive school reform providers. *American Educational Research Journal*, 44(2), 252-297.
- Rowan, B., Correnti, R., Miller, R. J., & Camburn, E. M. (2009). School improvement by design. *Lessons from a study of comprehensive school reform programs. Pennsylvania, PA: Consortium for Policy Research in Education*.
- Rowan, B. (1990). Commitment and control: Alternative strategies for the organizational design of schools. *Review of research in education*, 353-389.

- Scaccia, J. P., Cook, B. S., Lamont, A., Wandersman, A., Castellow, J., Katz, J., & Beidas, R. S. (2015). A practical implementation science heuristic for organizational readiness: R=MC2. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 43(4), 484-501.
- Shedd, J. B., & Bacharach, S. B. (1991). *Tangled hierarchies: Teachers as professionals and the management of schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sherer, J. Z., & Spillane, J. P. (2011). Constancy and change in work practice in schools: The role of organizational routines. *Teachers College Record*, 113(3), 611-657.
- Shernoff, E. S., & Kratochwill, T. R. (2007). Transporting an evidence-based classroom management program for preschoolers with disruptive behavior problems to a school: An analysis of implementation, outcomes, and contextual variables. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 22(3), 449.
- Spillane, J. P., Parise, L. M., & Sherer, J. Z. (2011). Organizational routines as coupling mechanisms policy, school administration, and the technical core. *American Educational Research Journal*, 48(3), 586-619.
- Spillane, J. P., Zoltners, J. (2011). Constancy and change in work practice in schools: The role of organizational routines. *Teachers College Record*, 113 (3), 611–657.
- Spillane, J. P., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J. B. (2004). Towards a theory of leadership practice: A distributed perspective. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 36, 3–34.
- Simonsen, B., Eber, L., Black, A. C., Sugai, G., Lewandowski, H., Sims, B., & Myers, D. (2012). Illinois statewide positive behavioral interventions and supports: Evolution and impact on student outcomes across years. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 14(1), 5-16.
- Skiba, Russell J., et al. (2005). Unproven links: can poverty explain ethnic disproportionality in special education? *The Journal of Special Education* 39(3): 130-144.
- Stoiber, K., & Gettinger, M. (2011). Functional assessment and positive support strategies for promoting resilience: Effects on teachers and high-risk children. *Psychology in the Schools*, 48(7).
- Stormont, M., Smith, S., & Lewis, T. (2007). Teacher implementation of precorrection and praise statements in Head Start classrooms as a component of a program-wide system of positive behavior support. *Journal of Behavioral Education*, 16(1), 280-290.
- Taylor, S. J., & Bogdan, R. (1984). Introduction to qualitative research methods: The search for meanings. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley & Sons.
- Tried and true classroom games and greetings*. (2010). Minneapolis: Origins.

- Tyre, A., Feuerborn, L., & Lilly, K. (2010). Planning for sustainable implementation of schoolwide positive behavior support: Lessons learned from an elementary school case example. *ERS Spectrum*, 28(3), 25-33.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2014, September 23). U.S. Department of Education invests more than \$70 million to improve school climate and keep students safe. [Press release]. Retrieved from <http://www.ed.gov/news/press-releases/us-department-education-invests-more-70-million-improve-school-climate-and-keep-students-safe>
- Walker, H. M., Horner, R. H., Sugai, G., Bullis, M., Sprague, J. R., Bricker, D., & Kaufman, M. J. (1996). Integrated approaches to preventing antisocial behavior patterns among school-age children and youth. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, 4(4), 194-209.
- Webster-Stratton, C., Reinke, W. M., Herman, K. C., & Newcomer, L. L. (2011). The incredible years teacher classroom management training: The methods and principles that support fidelity of training delivery. *Online Submission*, 40(4), 509-529.
- Weick, K. (1976) Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 21(1), 1-19.
- Wehby, J. H., Maggin, D. M., Partin, T. C. M., & Robertson, R. (2012). The impact of working alliance, social validity, and teacher burnout on implementation fidelity of the good behavior game. *School Mental Health*, 4(1), 22-33.
- Yin, R. (2003). K.(2003). Case study research: Design and methods. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 5 (11).